

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

MARCH, 1834.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

ART. I.—*Fanaticism.* By the Author of "*The Natural History of Enthusiasm.*" London: Holdsworth & Ball. 1833. Pp.viii. 515. 8vo.

THE eloquent and powerful writer of the learned volume on our table is already known to the readers of the CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER. In our Miscellany for the months of March and April, 1832, were viewed his "*Natural History of Enthusiasm,*" and spoke in terms of high encomium of that masterly publication. There were certain portions of the work, however, to which we felt it our duty to object, as involving errors of considerable magnitude: but these were so few in number, when compared with the general excellence of the History, that, in the announcement of the treatise which we are now submitting to the public, we anticipated a happy renewal of our acquaintance with the instructive historian, to whose lucubrations we owe so much obligation. In his "*Fanaticism,*" we recognize the same depth of thought,—the same power of language,—the same poetical illustrations,—the same vivid descriptions,—the same convincing argument,—as characterise his "*Enthusiasm.*" We are compelled, alas! to add, that we discover in these pages the same mischievous errors which marked his former essay. There is, moreover, a mysterious vagueness in some of our Author's views, and a latitudinarian tendency in other points, especially upon topics of *Ecclesiastical Polity and Church Communion*, which we sorely lament and solemnly condemn! Our author is neither Calvinist, nor Socinian, nor Puritan, nor Methodist, nor Revolutionist, nor yet, we suspect, a member of our Establishment; least of all, is he a Papist. *What*, then, is he? We *guess*, (for we *know* nothing of him but from his writings,) that he is an "Independent," and, probably, a minister of that sect. Whatever, and whosoever he be, he is a man of first-rate talent; and upon the completion of his projected labours, (for he proposes to enlighten us upon the kindred subjects of "*Superstition,*" "*Credulity,*" "*Spiritual*

Despotism," "*Corruption of Morals*," and "*Scepticism*," or "*Philosophic Irreligion*,") he will, doubtless, secure for himself a conspicuous place amongst the best authors of his country. But we warn him with friendly voice to remember, that his talents are a trust, for the right discharge of which he is answerable to a higher tribunal than man's; that no philosophic paradox should entice him from the path of Truth; that no sectarian bias should be permitted to sway his judgment, and that in handling "the sword of the Spirit" unskillfully, he may slay *himself* as well as others, and inflict a deadly wound upon his *own* soul! Let him not prostitute his splendid talents to the wretched purposes of factious clamour! Let him aim at a prize more valuable than the ephemeral popularity attaching to the flippant abettors of the lax principles of modern religionists, or of fashionable infidels, who decry our Church, because they have neither wit to comprehend her *usefulness*, nor grace to appreciate her *doctrines*, nor judgment to understand her *polity*, nor temper to bear her *discipline*! Let him not think religious establishments evil, because some imperfections belong to them;—let him not fondly imagine that religious societies can long exist in the entireness of Christian faith without established *Forms*, and *Symbols*, and *Rites*; nor that these necessary adjuncts of Christianity can be fixed upon a stable basis, without the controlling discipline of Ghostly Power! We have thought it necessary to make these remarks, and thus to qualify our praise of the volume before us, because we *seem* to have discovered in its pages a *leaning* to these unfortunate errors.

Our readers shall judge for themselves, by our analysis of the work before us. It consists of *ten* sections; in the *first* of which our author declares "*the motives of the work*," and claims for himself "*the purest intentions*," and the tenderest sympathy for the mistakes of our luckless nature, which so deeply affect the welfare of the human family. Neither asperity nor levity should be exhibited in discussions of religious perversions; but lenity rather, and that gentleness, which is characteristic of the wisdom from above. Our author speaks of a "*Personal consciousness of the readiness with which the most egregious perversions of feeling at first recommend themselves to the human mind*." Are we to take this as applicable to *himself*?

It may happen (he writes) that a mind natively sound, and one now governed by the firmest principles, has, in an early stage, or in some short era of its course, so far yielded to the influence of irregular or vehement sentiments as to give it ever after a sympathy, even with the most extreme cases of the same order; so that, by the combined aid of personal experience and observation, the profound abyss wherein exorbitant religious ideas take their course may successfully be explored; nor merely explored, but its fearful contents brought forth and described, and this, too, in the spirit of humanity, or with the feeling of one who, far from affecting to look down as from a pinnacle upon the follies of his fellow-men, speaks in kindness of their errors, as being himself liable to every infirmity that besets the human heart and understanding.—Sect. I. pp. 4, 5.

In the *spirit* of kindness which should direct the performance of such a task as the one before him, our author describes the *motive* to it. Amongst these motives he numbers the prevailing hope of the universal spread of the gospel, to the accomplishment of which the banishment of all false and exaggerated sentiments and feelings is clearly necessary.

The URGENT REASON why we should now dismiss from our own bosoms every taint of superstition, and every residue of unbelief, as well as whatever is fanatical, is this,—that the world,—even the deluded millions of our brethren, may at length receive the blessings of the gospel.—Sect. I. p. 9.

Since the dependence of the religious welfare of mankind upon the purity of the Christian Body is an undoubted reality, there needs no apology for attempting to cleanse it, however severe be the scrutiny adopted, provided the *spirit* and the *intention* of the reproof of spiritual delinquencies be christian.

No, we must not flinch, although the sensitiveness and the vanity of thousands among us were to be intensely hurt. Let all,—all be humbled, if such humiliation is indeed a necessary process that shall facilitate the conversion of the world.—Sect. I. p. 15.

Such is the *prime* motive of our author. He hopes, too, to minister a preservative against future delusions and possible extravagances, which may appal the world, when “disbelief, the ephemeron of our times,” may be succeeded by impassioned fanaticism, and spiritual intolerance, and virulent credulity.

Having thus stated the *prime* and *secondary motives* of his work, our author defines, in his second Section, “the meaning of his terms,” and describes the “rise of the malign emotions.” The necessity of such definition is obvious; for more than half the differences which have embittered the hearts of furious theologues and angry disputants, have flowed from the use of words misunderstood and misapplied. The subject of FANATICISM peculiarly challenges the most guarded accuracy from its painter. Without any pedantic scrupulousness as to the niceties of language, our author would, therefore, endeavour to make himself understood, while he describes “a certain class of pernicious sentiments, which have too often been combined with religious belief.”

It will be found (he says) that the elementary idea attaching to the term Fanaticism is that of *fictional fervour* in religion, rendered turbulent, morose, or rancorous, by junction with some one or more of the unsocial emotions. Or, if a definition as brief as possible were demanded, we should say, that FANATICISM IS ENTHUSIASM INFLAMED BY HATRED.—Sect. II. pp. 29, 30.

Be it so; let “*malevolence be essential to Fanaticism, and distinguish it from enthusiasm*” (p. 352.); let “*Fanaticism always combine malign and imaginative sentiments*” (p. 324.) We make no captious objection to this definition, and, as language is matter of mere convention, are willing that our author should put his own interpretation upon his own terms. The coin issuing from his rich mint shall wear, if he please, the

stamp and mark of his own choice. *Malevolence*, then, being a characteristic ingredient of the fanatic, our author descants upon "*the rise of the malign emotions*."

Our subject (he says) being an instance of the combination of these emotions with other principles, we ought distinctly to have in view the elements, and to note also some of their coalescent forms.—Sect. II. p. 30.

It has seldom been our good fortune to read any metaphysical disquisition so eloquent, so simple, so profound, so beautiful, as *that* with which our author has delighted us in the subsequent pages of this admirable section. He has united the truth of *Aristotle* with the precision of *Reid*. He has joined the rigid accuracy of *Locke* with the fervid eloquence of *Stewart*. We beg our readers to consult these excellent pages of the volume under review, with the assurance of ample recompense for their study. No abridgement can do justice to his argument upon this delicate and difficult portion of his analysis, where he endeavours "to trace the original construction of passions, that scarcely ever present themselves otherwise than in an exaggerated and corrupted condition." He assumes, that all our passions are given to us for some specific *end*, which must, therefore, *limit* the *means*. So that—

—either by EXCESS and too great intensity,—or by PERVERSION, *i. e.* misdirection from their proper object,—or by PROLONGATION from momentary impulses to habits and permanent qualities, as well the animal appetites as the irascible passions assume a pernicious form, and derange the harmony of nature.—P. 31.

The simplicity and the fitness of the mental machinery of man for repelling evil are amongst the evidences of the wisdom and benevolence of the Author of nature. That they are perverted and abused by us, is amongst the proofs of our fallen state, and is necessarily contingent upon the qualities inherent in a *moral* agent like ourselves. By extending themselves beyond their proper occasions, the irascible passions,—the sun going down upon them,—are transformed into *habits*; from momentary *energies* they become *dispositions*. They impute to an adversary, not a transient hostility, but "an evil nature," and a settled animosity like their own. Hence arises the bitterness of hatred, inflamed by the conviction of the innate atrocity of its foe, whose destruction is the only assuagement of the torment that burns the heart.

Inflamed and insatiate (we beg our readers to mark the beauty of the *simile*), the distracted being returns ever and again to the salt stream, that, at every draught, aggravates its thirst.—P. 44.

Yet hatred, in the most furious, cannot long indulge itself, until it has attributed an ill intention to the object of its wrath; because the laws of our moral system forbid that any thing should be hated, but what is thought to *deserve* abhorrence. In the beautiful illustration of

our author, "the most virulent heart has no power of ejecting its venom upon a fair surface; it must slur whatever it means to poison." Hence the misanthrope for ever dwells upon the badness of the human race. So the deliberate hatred of God is ever preceded by *blasphemy*, in word or thought. We cannot hate the sovereign goodness without first *defaming* it! Our *vindictive* impulses are governed by the same moral laws. Hence the instinct of *retribution*. Thus is it manifest that—

—the elements of the moral system are the foundation even of the most fatal of the malignant passions, and in their most aggravated forms.—P. 50.

Our eloquent essayist draws an inference from the preceding analysis, which is *original*, we think, as we are sure it is *awful*, when connected with the final punishment of sinners. We give the concluding paragraph in his powerful language, and beseech God to imprint upon our heart of hearts the appalling truth.

The infatuations of self-love, which, in the present state, defend every mind from the application to itself of the desire of retribution, in the same manner as the principle of animal life defends the vital organs of a body from the chemical action of its own caustic secretions,—being then quite dispersed, the Instinct of Justice,—perhaps the most potent of all the elements of the spiritual life, shall turn inward upon each consciously guilty heart, so that every such heart shall become the prey of a reflected rage, intense and corrosive as the most virulent revenge! Whoever is now hurrying on without thought of consequences through a course of crimes, would do well to imagine the condition of a being left without relief to breathe upon itself the flames of an insatiable hatred!!!—P. 52.

From this analysis our author descends, in Section III., to the "*alliance of the malign emotions with the imagination*," by which their deformity is concealed, and their harshness greatly mitigated, and their most rancorous elements refined. Hence the curse of war has been softened in its attendant horrors, and the imaginative sentiments, blending themselves with destructive passions, have chivalrously chastened the ferocity of warriors; but for which ameliorating emotions, "Alexander would have been a Tamerlane, and Tamerlane as the Angel of Death." This alliance of the malign passions with the imagination is not permitted to take place on the narrow ground of self-love. Our author descants upon this remarkable fact with his wonted talent, and his usual power of beautiful illustration. Our limits forbid us to accompany him in his statements. He tells us that—

a vigorous enthusiasm must embrace a broad field. *Martial* enthusiasm especially demands the *social* elements as its ground. It is the enthusiasm of *gregarious* rage that knits the phalanx, shoulder to shoulder, when the marshalled family advances to meet its ancient rival in the field.

Here we have that very compound sentiment, which, as to its construction, stands immediately parallel with religious rancour and fanaticism. The one species of ardent emotion differs from the other more in adjuncts and objects, than in innate quality or character. The battle-fury of the CLAN is only self-love, inflamed by hatred, and expanded, by aid of the imagination, over the width of the community with which the individual consorts.—P. 60.

This last observation, touching the *limits* within which enthusiasm acts,—for too wide a field of exercise renders her energies languid,—is ably illustrated by comparing the steady martial temper of the armies of a great empire, with the ferocious or desperate valour that distinguishes the warriors of a horde, a canton, or a petty republic. But how, our readers may ask, is all this made to bear upon the topic of the treatise under review? Our author shall teach them the application.

It is on the very same principle, that Fanaticism must attach itself always to a limited order of things, and is necessarily *factious*. What is Fanaticism but rancorous enthusiasm? And inasmuch as Enthusiasm springs from the imagination, it must embrace a circle just wide enough to give it a powerful impulse, and yet not too wide to exhaust its forces.—P. 64.

Although a beneficial mitigation issue from this alliance of the grosser elements of our nature with the imaginative sentiments, it must not be permitted to interfere with the genuine principles of morals, as enforced in the Scriptures; and it is difficult to assign the proper office to the imagination when mingling itself with the malign emotions, especially under circumstances, where cherished associations of sentiment have pre-occupied the heart corrupted by false feelings, or debased by false worship. The story of the Crusades is adduced, in the hands of our author, to exemplify this position; of which he truly says,—

Only let us strip their history of all its elements of martial and secular glory, and the simple *religious residue*, the proper fanaticism of the drama,—would scarcely touch any modern imagination.—P. 68.

The fourth Section, describing the “*combination of the malign emotions with spurious religious sentiments*,” shews us that “*Fanaticism is the offspring of Enthusiasm*.” Spurious piety,—*reason* being in subjection to the *imagination*,—is converted into energetic rancour; and this rancour re-acts upon the enthusiasm whence it sprang; the child schools the parent; and this enthusiasm, so changed by fanaticism,—malignity being shed upon illusion,—is far more darkly coloured and more mysterious than the illusory piety disembarassed of such a load.

This sort of transmutation of sentiments, which happens when the *enthusiast* becomes the *fanatic*,—much resembles what often takes place in feverish sleep;—who has not seen in his dreams splendid and smiling pageants, gradually relinquishing the brilliant colours they first showed, just as if the summer's sun were sinking from the skies; but presently a murky glimmer half reveals menacing forms; and in the next moment some horrid and gory phantom starts forth, and becomes master of the scene?—P. 75.

This false religion of the fanatic is distinguished by *three* characteristics:

- I. A deference to *Malignant Invisible Power*.
- II. Rancorous contempt, or detestation of the mass of mankind, as religiously cursed and abominable.
- III. The belief of corrupt favouritism on the part of Invisible Powers, towards a select or particular class of men.—P. 76.

We would willingly follow our author through the whole of this Section, whence, whether we consulted the *profit* or the *pleasure* of our readers, our extracts could scarcely be too copious. All that he has written of the tendency of the mythology of Greece to counteract the *natural religion* of man, which is based on the fear of *malignant* powers; all that he has written of the misanthropy of the *Jew*, the intolerance of the *Mohammedan*, and the insatiate bigotry of the *Papist*, is new and admirable. Not less admirable is our author's description of the dependence between our conceptions of the Divine Being, and our feelings towards our fellow-men, including, as it does, a philosophical refutation of the harsh and unscriptural tenets of the school of *Calvin*! We beg our readers to peruse this portion of the volume before us, and to ask themselves whether the dogmas of *Geneva* CAN be true! Intolerance, execrations, cruelty, pride, and arrogance, have ever marked the dupes of *that malign theology*, by whom the *herd* of mankind is spurned as abominable, and shut out from the narrow circle of their charities. We heartily thank our author for his masterly destruction of this pestilent error, and we willingly adorn our pages with the following extract, as a fair sample of his brilliant style.

The Fanatic, inasmuch as he is an Enthusiast born, must take up yet another and a more sparkling element of character; and it is nothing else than the supposition of corrupt favouritism on the part of the Deity he worships, toward himself and the faction of which he is a member. The Fanatic, and this we must keep in mind, is not a simple misanthrope, nor the creature of sheer hatred and cruelty; he does not move like a venomous reptile lurking in a crevice, or winding silent through the grass; but soars in mid heaven as a fiery flying serpent, and looks down from on high upon whom he hates. Imaginative by temperament, his emotions are allied to hope and presumption, more closely than to fear and despondency: he firmly believes, therefore, in the favour of the supernal powers towards their faithful votaries; and in expectation of still more signal boons than he has yet received, offers himself to their service, as the unflinching champion of their interests on earth.

And besides, as we have already said, the imagination, when brought into play by self-love, must draw its excitements from a circle, which it can embrace. It will then be a tribe, a sect, a faction; that affords a sphere to fanaticism; and the infuriate religionist, how unsocial soever in temper, is compelled to love *a few*, so that he may be able, in the strength of that partial feeling, to hate the many with full intensity. . . . Theological notions, when sullied or distorted, vitiate in an extreme degree every sentiment of the deluded being who deems himself the *darling of the skies*. Let but such a pestilent doctrine be admitted as that the Divine favour is bestowed, not merely in disregard of virtue, but in contempt of it, and then religion, with all its power, goes over to swell the torrent of impurity, cupidity, and malice. Under patronage of a belief like this, virtue and vice change sides in the court of conscience, and the latter claims sacred honours.—Pp. 84—86.

Recapitulating his *three* elements of Fanaticism, our author seizes upon certain leading varieties of his subject, which are reduced to *four* designations: the

First comprehends the instances of malignant religious sentiments

which turn inward upon the unhappy subject of them; this he calls the Fanaticism of the SCOURGE: the

Second class embraces that virulent sort of Fanaticism which looks abroad for its victims; this he calls the Fanaticism of the BRAND: the

Third class comprehends the combination of intemperate religious zeal with *military* sentiments, or with national pride and the love of power; this he designates the Fanaticism of the BANNER: the

Fourth class is reserved for instances of intellectual Fanaticism, in opinion and dogma; this he names the Fanaticism of the SYMBOL.

The first sort is *austere*; the second, *cruel*; the third, *ambitious*; and the fourth, *factions*.

These several classes of Fanaticism form the respective subjects of Sections V., VI., VII., and VIII. of this able volume. With a short analysis of their several contents we shall proceed to gratify our readers, reminding them that our *review* is necessarily *limited*, and entreating them to consult the eloquent pages of our author for themselves, if they would indeed be enabled to appreciate his multifold merits. We leave them with this prayer for the present, and purpose to resume our article next month.



ART. II.—*Horæ Homileticæ: or Discourses (principally in the form of Skeletons) now first digested into one continued Series, and forming a Commentary upon every Book of the Old and New Testament; to which is annexed, an Improved Edition of a Translation of Claude's Essay on the Composition of a Sermon. In Twenty-one Volumes. By the Rev. CHARLES SIMEON, M. A. Senior Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. London: Holdsworth & Ball. 1833. 8vo.*

(Continued from p. 77.)

THE plan of our criticism now leads us to consider, III. Mr. Simeon's execution of his design. And this we shall examine in the twofold aspect in which the design itself appears; as, 1. A "help to composition;" and 2. as an expository comment.

1. The execution of his plan in the first of these respects is Mr. Simeon's great praise, and the especial excellence of his work. This fact must be already so well known to the majority of our readers, that it seems superfluous to mention it. We are far from intending to depreciate Mr. Simeon's other qualifications as a divine or pastor, when we say that, as a *composer of sermons*, he stands altogether unrivalled. In this judgment we mean no commendation of style or manner. In those respects few preachers vary so much; and in the University pulpit, as we have hinted, he almost loses his identity with the Rector of Trinity.

But, when we speak of *composition*, we take the word in its proper etymological meaning of *putting together*; and, in this particular, his readiness, ingenuity, facility and logical arrangement are quite surprising. On any given text he will readily construct several sermons, essentially different in mode of treatment and argument; yet all closely accordant with the text, and all equally fresh and original. It is an inevitable disadvantage to this part of our criticism that we can but sparingly illustrate by example. To quote the skeletons *partially*, could give no idea of their merits *as entire compositions*, and it would be impossible, for want of room, to transcribe many at length: we must therefore content ourselves by informing the reader that he will find, subjoined to Claude's Essay, *four* independent skeletons on Mark xvi. 15, 16, illustrating Claude's various methods of discussion; by explication, observation, propositions, and perpetual application. Besides these, a *sermon* on the same text appears in its proper place. To the student this is an invaluable exercise; indeed we know nothing that will afford him greater facilities of invention or arrangement, than endeavouring to construct independent skeletons according to these various systems on the basis of one text.

Claude's Essay, as edited by Mr. Simeon, is a most useful and admirable treatise; and the additions are by no means the least valuable part. To enter into a minute review of it would be here impossible; nor would it be necessary, as the work is very generally known. Our notice of it, therefore, will be principally confined to what has been improved, or particularly insisted on. Some of the principles contained in the improved essay are so deeply founded in philosophical truth that to produce them is to speak their commendation. Preachers, and especially juniors, are apt to think that the various parts of a text, discussed in their order, with a due attention to their connexion, adequately elucidate the whole. Thus, in treating Heb. x. 10, they would arrange thus; 1. The will of God. 2. Our sanctification. 3. The cause of our sanctification. But Mr. Simeon, after Claude, judges otherwise, and considers the great essential of pulpit composition to consist in reduction of texts to categorical forms.

Most texts ought to be formally divided; for which purpose you must principally have regard to the order of nature, and put that division, which naturally precedes, in the first place; and the rest must follow, each in its proper order. This may easily be done by reducing the text to a categorical proposition, beginning with the subject, passing to the attribute, and then to the other terms; your judgment will direct you how to place them.

If, for example, I were to preach from Heb. x. 10, "By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all;" I should not think it proper to speak first of the will of God, then of our sanctification, and, lastly, of the cause of our sanctification, which is, the oblation of the body of Jesus Christ: it would be much better to reduce the text to a categorical proposition: thus, *The offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once made, sanctifies us by the will of God*; for it is more natural to consider, 1. The

nearer and more *immediate cause* of our acceptance, which is, *the oblation of the body of Jesus Christ*; 2. Its *effect, our sanctification*; 3. Its first and more *remote cause*, which makes it produce this effect, *the will of God*.

[The Editor wishes the student to pause here, and to avail himself fully of the hint just thrown out, of *reducing a subject to a categorical proposition*, and then treating it in its natural order.

This is, in fact, *the great secret*, (so to speak,) of all composition for the pulpit. Every text, whether long or short, must be reduced to a categorical proposition; 1st, In order to preserve a perfect unity in the subject; and, 2dly, in order to take it up, and prosecute it in an orderly manner.—Pp. 306, 307.

Mr. Simeon prosecutes this subject with the following admirable remarks: which we readily copy as a treasure for our clerical friends.

THE RULES WHICH THE EDITOR WOULD GIVE FOR THE COMPOSITION OF A SERMON, ARE THESE.

1. Take for your subject that which you believe to be the mind of God in the passage before you.

(Be careful to understand the passage thoroughly: and regard nothing but the mind of God in it.)

2. Mark *the character* of the passage.

(It may be more simple, as a declaration, a precept, a promise, a threatening, an invitation, an appeal; or more complex, as a cause and effect; a principle, and a consequence; an action, and a motive to that action, and, whatever be *the character of the text*, (especially if it be clearly marked) *let that direct you in the arrangement of your discourse upon it*. (See what Mr. Claude says near the beginning of Chap. V.)

For instance. 1 John iv. 18, "There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment. He that feareth, is not made perfect in love."

This passage should not be treated in a common-place way of shewing, 1st. What this love is; 2d. What is the fear which it casts out; and 3d. How it casts out this fear. The passage is intended to shew *the influence* of the love of God upon the soul, and to set it forth as *a test* of our attainments in true piety; and therefore the scope and intent of it should be seized as the ground-work of the division. Thus—Consider the love of God: 1. Its influence as a principle (casting out all slavish fear;) and, 2. Its importance as a test; (enabling us, by means of its influence in this respect, to estimate the precise measure of our attainments.) See the arrangement of Rev. xix. 6.

3. Mark *the spirit* of the passage.

(It may be tender and compassionate, or indignant, or menacing: but whatever it be, let *that be the spirit of your discourse*. To be tender on an indignant passage, or indignant on one that is tender, would destroy half the force and beauty of the discourse. The soul should be filled with the subject, and breathe out the very spirit of it before the people. As God's ambassadors, we should speak all that he speaks; and *as he speaks it*. God himself should be heard in us and through us.)

The true *meaning* of the text should be *the warp*, which pervades the whole piece: and the *words* should be *the woof* that is to be interwoven, so as to form one connected and continued whole.

The spirit of the words should pervade the discourse upon them. Whatever peculiarity there be either in the matter or manner of the text, that should be transfused into the discourse, and bear the same measure of prominence in the sermon, as it bears in the text itself.

Take for instance, Ps. cxlvii. 11, "The Lord taketh pleasure in them that fear him, in those that hope in his mercy;" you would give *the sense*

of the text, if you were to set forth, 1st. The characters described, and, 2d. God's favour towards them: but if you were to shew from that text, 1st. *How low God descends for the objects of his favour*; and, 2d. *How high he soars in his regards towards them*; you would mark, and every one of your audience would feel, *the spirit* of them. If the reader consult the discourse on John i. 45, he will find that the spirit of the text, that is, *the joy expressed in it*, serves as a foundation for one half of the discourse. So also if he will consult the discourse on Jer. v. 23, 24, he will find that *the spirit* of that text gives the entire tone to the subject. The common way of treating that text would be to consider, 1. The mercies which God has vouchsafed to us, and, 2. The effect which they ought to produce upon us. But with such a division of the subject, the *vituperative spirit* of it would be comparatively lost.*

If these few hints be thoroughly understood and duly attended to, the composition of a sermon, which is supposed to be so difficult, will become extremely easy. And the Editor cannot render the student a greater service, than by entreating him to fix these short rules deeply in his mind, and when studying for the pulpit, carefully to seize the *sense*, the *character*, and the *spirit* of his text.]—Pp. 307—309.

We are sceptical as to the "extreme ease" of sermon writing, even with the aid of these rules. Mr. Simeon may have a right to talk of such things, as to him this labour does indeed seem to have no existence. But with us "dwindled sons of little men," the composition of a sermon will still be "supposed to be difficult," although the difficulty is undoubtedly diminished, and the structure of the composition unquestionably improved by an attention to Mr. Simeon's observations and rules.

We are decidedly of opinion that this reduction of texts to categorical propositions is founded in truth and nature, and much more likely to produce a good illustrative and applicatory discourse than the ordinary method of divisions, which are often less connected with the sense than with the wording of a passage. It has at least this advantage, that it makes the preacher *study* the meaning of his text, and confine himself to that meaning. Many texts might be instanced which, according to the ordinary mode of treatment, could never be properly illustrated, and which could only receive their due development from the adoption of this system. We will adduce one example only: Matt. v. 44, "Love your enemies." The ordinary method of divisions would treat this text thus: 1. What love is. 2. Who are our enemies. Now this alone, it is obvious, would be wholly inadequate to the illustration or enforcement of the *categorical proposition* implied in the text, that *it is the duty of a Christian to entertain every feeling of kindness and affection towards those who are actuated by the most opposite sentiments towards him*. It is true that this method frequently conducts us to the ordinary division of a sermon, for most texts selected for the pulpit are categorical propo-

* See on Dan. v. 22. or 1 Thess. iv. 1.

which turn inward upon the unhappy subject of them; this he calls the Fanaticism of the SCOURGE: the

Second class embraces that virulent sort of Fanaticism which looks abroad for its victims; this he calls the Fanaticism of the BRAND: the

Third class comprehends the combination of intemperate religious zeal with *military* sentiments, or with national pride and the love of power; this he designates the Fanaticism of the BANNER: the

Fourth class is reserved for instances of intellectual Fanaticism, in opinion and dogma; this he names the Fanaticism of the SYMBOL.

The first sort is *austere*; the second, *cruel*; the third, *ambitious*; and the fourth, *factions*.

These several classes of Fanaticism form the respective subjects of Sections V., VI., VII., and VIII. of this able volume. With a short analysis of their several contents we shall proceed to gratify our readers, reminding them that our *review* is necessarily *limited*, and entreating them to consult the eloquent pages of our author for themselves, if they would indeed be enabled to appreciate his multifold merits. We leave them with this prayer for the present, and purpose to resume our article next month.

ART. II.—*Horæ Homileticæ: or Discourses (principally in the form of Skeletons) now first digested into one continued Series, and forming a Commentary upon every Book of the Old and New Testament; to which is annexed, an Improved Edition of a Translation of Claude's Essay on the Composition of a Sermon. In Twenty-one Volumes. By the Rev. CHARLES SIMEON, M. A. Senior Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. London: Holdsworth & Ball. 1833. 8vo.*

(Continued from p. 77.)

THE plan of our criticism now leads us to consider, III. Mr. Simeon's execution of his design. And this we shall examine in the twofold aspect in which the design itself appears; as, 1. A "help to composition;" and 2. as an expository comment.

1. The execution of his plan in the first of these respects is Mr. Simeon's great praise, and the especial excellence of his work. This fact must be already so well known to the majority of our readers, that it seems superfluous to mention it. We are far from intending to depreciate Mr. Simeon's other qualifications as a divine or pastor, when we say that, as a *composer of sermons*, he stands altogether unrivalled. In this judgment we mean no commendation of style or manner. In those respects few preachers vary so much; and in the University pulpit, as we have hinted, he almost loses his identity with the Rector of Trinity.

But, when we speak of *composition*, we take the word in its proper etymological meaning of *putting together*; and, in this particular, his readiness, ingenuity, facility and logical arrangement are quite surprising. On any given text he will readily construct several sermons, essentially different in mode of treatment and argument; yet all closely accordant with the text, and all equally fresh and original. It is an inevitable disadvantage to this part of our criticism that we can but sparingly illustrate by example. To quote the skeletons *partially*, could give no idea of their merits *as entire compositions*, and it would be impossible, for want of room, to transcribe many at length: we must therefore content ourselves by informing the reader that he will find, subjoined to Claude's Essay, *four* independent skeletons on Mark xvi. 15, 16, illustrating Claude's various methods of discussion; by explication, observation, propositions, and perpetual application. Besides these, a *sermon* on the same text appears in its proper place. To the student this is an invaluable exercise; indeed we know nothing that will afford him greater facilities of invention or arrangement, than endeavouring to construct independent skeletons according to these various systems on the basis of one text.

Claude's Essay, as edited by Mr. Simeon, is a most useful and admirable treatise; and the additions are by no means the least valuable part. To enter into a minute review of it would be here impossible; nor would it be necessary, as the work is very generally known. Our notice of it, therefore, will be principally confined to what has been improved, or particularly insisted on. Some of the principles contained in the improved essay are so deeply founded in philosophical truth that to produce them is to speak their commendation. Preachers, and especially juniors, are apt to think that the various parts of a text, discussed in their order, with a due attention to their connexion, adequately elucidate the whole. Thus, in treating Heb. x. 10, they would arrange thus; 1. The will of God. 2. Our sanctification. 3. The cause of our sanctification. But Mr. Simeon, after Claude, judges otherwise, and considers the great essential of pulpit composition to consist in reduction of texts to categorical forms.

Most texts ought to be formally divided; for which purpose you must principally have regard to the order of nature, and put that division, which naturally precedes, in the first place; and the rest must follow, each in its proper order. This may easily be done by reducing the text to a categorical proposition, beginning with the subject, passing to the attribute, and then to the other terms; your judgment will direct you how to place them.

If, for example, I were to preach from Heb. x. 10, "By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all;" I should not think it proper to speak first of the will of God, then of our sanctification, and, lastly, of the cause of our sanctification, which is, the oblation of the body of Jesus Christ: it would be much better to reduce the text to a categorical proposition: thus, *The offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once made, sanctifies us by the will of God*; for it is more natural to consider, 1. The

nearer and more *immediate cause* of our acceptance, which is, *the oblation of the body of Jesus Christ*; 2. Its *effect*, our *sanctification*; 3. Its first and more *remote cause*, which makes it produce this effect, *the will of God*.

[The Editor wishes the student to pause here, and to avail himself fully of the hint just thrown out, of *reducing a subject to a categorical proposition*, and then treating it in its natural order.

This is, in fact, *the great secret*, (so to speak,) of all composition for the pulpit. Every text, whether long or short, must be reduced to a categorical proposition; 1st, In order to preserve a perfect unity in the subject; and, 2dly, in order to take it up, and prosecute it in an orderly manner.—Pp. 306, 307.

Mr. Simeon prosecutes this subject with the following admirable remarks: which we readily copy as a treasure for our clerical friends.

THE RULES WHICH THE EDITOR WOULD GIVE FOR THE COMPOSITION OF A SERMON, ARE THESE.

1. Take for your subject that which you believe to be the mind of God in the passage before you.

(Be careful to understand the passage thoroughly: and regard nothing but the mind of God in it.)

2. Mark *the character of the passage*.

(It may be more simple, as a declaration, a precept, a promise, a threatening, an invitation, an appeal; or more complex, as a cause and effect; a principle, and a consequence; an action, and a motive to that action, and, whatever be *the character of the text*, (especially if it be clearly marked) *let that direct you in the arrangement of your discourse upon it*. (See what Mr. Claude says near the beginning of Chap. V.)

For instance. 1 John iv. 18, "There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment. He that feareth, is not made perfect in love."

This passage should not be treated in a common-place way of shewing, 1st. What this love is; 2d. What is the fear which it casts out; and 3d. How it casts out this fear. The passage is intended to shew *the influence of the love of God upon the soul*, and to set it forth as *a test of our attainments in true piety*; and therefore the scope and intent of it should be seized as the ground-work of the division. Thus—Consider the love of God: 1. Its influence as a principle (casting out all slavish fear;) and, 2. Its importance as a test; (enabling us, by means of its influence in this respect, to estimate the precise measure of our attainments.) See the arrangement of Rev. xix. 6.

3. Mark *the spirit of the passage*.

(It may be tender and compassionate, or indignant, or menacing: but whatever it be, let *that be the spirit of your discourse*. To be tender on an indignant passage, or indignant on one that is tender, would destroy half the force and beauty of the discourse. The soul should be filled with the subject, and breathe out the very spirit of it before the people. As God's ambassadors, we should speak all that he speaks; and *as he speaks it*. God himself should be heard in us and through us.)

The true *meaning of the text should be the warp*, which pervades the whole piece: and the *words should be the woof* that is to be interwoven, so as to form one connected and continued whole.

The spirit of the words should pervade the discourse upon them. Whatever peculiarity there be either in the matter or manner of the text, that should be transfused into the discourse, and bear the same measure of prominence in the sermon, as it bears in the text itself.

Take for instance, Ps. cxlvii. 11, "The Lord taketh pleasure in them that fear him, in those that hope in his mercy;" you would give *the sense*

of the text, if you were to set forth, 1st. The characters described, and, 2d. God's favour towards them: but if you were to shew from that text, 1st. *How low God descends for the objects of his favour*; and, 2d. *How high he soars in his regards towards them*; you would mark, and every one of your audience would feel, *the spirit* of them. If the reader consult the discourse on John i. 45, he will find that the spirit of the text, that is, *the joy expressed in it*, serves as a foundation for one half of the discourse. So also if he will consult the discourse on Jer. v. 23, 24, he will find that *the spirit* of that text gives the entire tone to the subject. The common way of treating that text would be to consider, 1. The mercies which God has vouchsafed to us, and, 2. The effect which they ought to produce upon us. But with such a division of the subject, the *vituperative spirit* of it would be comparatively lost.*

If these few hints be thoroughly understood and duly attended to, the composition of a sermon, which is supposed to be so difficult, will become extremely easy. And the Editor cannot render the student a greater service, than by entreating him to fix these short rules deeply in his mind, and when studying for the pulpit, carefully to seize the *sense*, the *character*, and the *spirit* of his text.]—Pp. 307—309.

We are sceptical as to the "extreme ease" of sermon writing, even with the aid of these rules. Mr. Simeon may have a right to talk of such things, as to him this labour does indeed seem to have no existence. But with us "dwindled sons of little men," the composition of a sermon will still be "supposed to be difficult," although the difficulty is undoubtedly diminished, and the structure of the composition unquestionably improved by an attention to Mr. Simeon's observations and rules.

We are decidedly of opinion that this reduction of texts to categorical propositions is founded in truth and nature, and much more likely to produce a good illustrative and applicatory discourse than the ordinary method of divisions, which are often less connected with the sense than with the wording of a passage. It has at least this advantage, that it makes the preacher *study* the meaning of his text, and confine himself to that meaning. Many texts might be instanced which, according to the ordinary mode of treatment, could never be properly illustrated, and which could only receive their due development from the adoption of this system. We will adduce one example only: Matt. v. 44, "Love your enemies." The ordinary method of divisions would treat this text thus: 1. What love is. 2. Who are our enemies. Now this alone, it is obvious, would be wholly inadequate to the illustration or enforcement of the *categorical proposition* implied in the text, that *it is the duty of a Christian to entertain every feeling of kindness and affection towards those who are actuated by the most opposite sentiments towards him*. It is true that this method frequently conducts us to the ordinary division of a sermon, for most texts selected for the pulpit are categorical propo-

* See on Dan. v. 22, or 1 Thess. iv. 1.

sitions, and in these cases the ordinary division will commonly be the true. But Claude's rule will point out the *connexion* of the heads, which the common method, independently employed, will not. Mr. Simeon, however, has expressed himself in terms too general to be literally applied. He has not always reduced his own texts to categorical forms; and the reason is that many texts are incapable of it, as historical ones for instance. But even in the handling of *these*, it will be necessary to *deduce* propositions. Thus in Gen. vi. 22, "Thus did Noah; according to all that God commanded him, so did he." This is an *historical* proposition. Still however it is capable of yielding a categorical formula; as thus, *the true servants of God exhibit an uniform obedience*. This is the doctrine *deducible* from that text. And that doctrine may be explained in divisions.

Another partial exception to the categorical rule is that of *syncategorematica*, which Mr. Simeon terms "somewhat curious." Expressions, which, taken by themselves, have little or no meaning, sometimes, by their juxta-position with others, become the most emphatic words in the sentence. Claude and Mr. Simeon have adduced instances. Thus in John iii. 16, "God *so* loved the world," &c. the subject is the love of God; and the syncategorematicon *so*, which connects the propositions "God loved the world," and, "God gave his only-begotten Son," is the very soul of the text, as shewing how vast the love of God was. So in Exod. xxxiv. 5 and Deut. xxvii. 26, the syncategorematica "*there*" and "*amen*" are the most important words respectively. Mr. Simeon has given a skeleton on this text and on John xv. 15, where the emphatic word is *henceforth*.

To Claude's four modes of discussion we have already adverted. Mr. Simeon has applied them all to the illustration of the same text with a power and freedom truly astonishing. But they are not therefore all equally applicable to that or any other. The first is, in our opinion, the best suited to this particular text; and this opinion is fortified by the circumstance that Mr. Simeon's sermon on that text is composed on that plan. Were we in all cases restricted to one, we should prefer the last; but a text would often be most effectively treated by a combination of two or more.

We have reserved our quotations of entire skeletons for the illustration of the work *as a commentary*, in which light we now proceed to consider it; and indeed the nature of the skeletons is so well understood, that quotations for the purpose of explaining *that*, would be entirely superfluous.

2. Mr. Simeon's merits as an *expositor* and as a *commentator* differ. Setting aside his Calvinisms, he generally educes from whatever he handles pure and profitable doctrine. He does this, moreover, without straining his texts, and his inferences are the most natural and

legitimate, while many are such only as would present themselves to an inventive genius of the richest fertility. We speak *generally*; undoubtedly, there are exceptions; but they only confirm the rule. Nor would genius alone afford equipment for the task. Its execution evinces also

"Sound wisdom, labouring in the Scripture mine."

If Mr. Simeon be accused of misinterpreting the Scriptures, malice itself cannot charge him with deficient acquaintance with them. Let a clergyman about to expound a chapter orally, study it in Doddridge, or Henry, or Bishop Sumner, or Girdlestone; and then let him go over the texts in that chapter which Mr. Simeon has illustrated—with all the excellences of the former writers, we think the last will best furnish out the best appointed champion.

As a commentator, a guide to the grammatical, historical, or philological explanation of a passage, we do not so highly estimate Mr. Simeon's pretensions. We would not consult him for *biblical difficulties*. A distinguished theological friend, in a letter to us on the subject of the work now before us, invites our attention to Discourse CCCLXVI., as a signal instance of Mr. Simeon's success "in deducing and applying important general principles to the conduct of life;" and adds, "if you wished to give a whole skeleton as a specimen, you might select this." We shall readily do so; for it eminently illustrates all that we have said of Mr. Simeon as an expositor and a commentator. In the former view, it is all that our friend and ourselves have said; yet, while it admirably *applies* its theory, we cannot but hold that theory most mistaken. We shall, perhaps, recur at some future period to the subject of that litigated text.

CCCLXVI.

NAAMAN BOWING IN THE HOUSE OF RIMMON.

2 Kings v. 18, 19. *In this thing the Lord pardon thy servant, that when my master goeth into the house of Rimmon to worship there, and he leaneth on my hand, and I bow myself in the house of Rimmon: when I bow down myself in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy servant in this thing. And he said unto him, Go in peace.*

THE operation of divine grace is uniform in every age and place: it makes a total revolution in the views and habits of the person in whom it dwells. See how it wrought on Naaman! Before he felt its influence he was full of pride and unbelief; and notwithstanding his request for the healing of his leprosy was granted, yet because it was not granted in the precise way that he expected, he would not comply with the directions of the prophet, but "turned, and went away in a rage." But, when his leprosy was healed, and in conjunction with that mercy the grace of God wrought powerfully upon his soul, he returned with most heartfelt gratitude to the prophet, renounced his idol-worship, and devoted himself altogether to the God of Israel. At the same time however that he embraced the true religion, he made a request, which has been differently interpreted by different commentators; some vindicating it as illustrative

of a tender conscience, and others condemning it as an indication of an unsound mind.

We think that great and learned men are apt to judge of particular passages, according as their own general views and habits of life incline them: those who are lax in their own conduct, leaning too much to a laxity of interpretation; and those who are strict in their principles, not daring, as it were, to concede to men the liberty which God has given them.* But we should neither abridge the Christian's liberty, nor extend it beyond its just bounds: and we apprehend that the passage before us will assist us materially in assigning to it its proper limits, and will itself receive the most satisfactory interpretation when viewed according to its plain and obvious import.

We propose then to consider,

I. The concession here made—

We do not hesitate to call Elisha's answer a concession. To regard it as an evasion of the question is to dishonour the prophet exceedingly, and to contradict the plainest import of his words. His answer is precisely the same as that of Jethro to Moses; † and must be interpreted as an approbation of the plan proposed to him. Let us consider then the true import of Naaman's question—

[Naaman proposed to continue in the king of Syria's service, and to attend him as usual to the house of Rimmon, the god whom his master worshipped: and as his master always leaned upon his arm on those occasions, (a practice common with kings at that time, even with the kings of Israel, as well as others, ‡) he must of necessity accommodate himself to his master's motion, and bow forward when he did, in order not to obstruct him in his worship. This he proposed to do; and his communication of his intentions to the prophet must be understood in a two-fold view; namely, *As an inquiry for the regulation of his judgment, and as a guard against a misconstruction of his conduct.*

The case was certainly one of great difficulty, and especially to a young convert, to whom such considerations were altogether new. On the one hand, he felt in his own mind that he should not participate in the worship of his master; and yet he felt that his conduct would be open to such a construction. Having therefore access to an inspired prophet, he was glad to have his difficulty solved, that so he might act as became a servant of Jehovah, and enjoy the testimony of a good conscience.

Being determined, if the prophet should approve of it, so to act, he desired to cut off all occasion for blame from others. He knew how ready people are to view things in an unfavourable light; and that, if he should do this thing of himself, he might appear to be unfaithful to his convictions, and to have relapsed into idolatry: he therefore entered, as it were, a protest against any such surmises, and gave a public pledge that he would do nothing that should be inconsistent with his professed attachment to Jehovah.

In this view of the subject, his question was every way right and proper. The honour of God and the salvation of his own soul depended on his not doing any thing that should be inconsistent with his profession; and therefore he did right to ask advice: and lest he should by any means cast a stumbling-block before others, he did well in explaining his views and intentions beforehand. What terrible evils had well nigh arisen from the neglect of such a precaution, when the tribes of Reuben and of Gad erected an altar on the banks of Jordan! § — — — On the other hand, what evils were avoided, when Paul explained his sentiments in the first instance *privately* to the elders of Jerusalem, instead of exciting prejudice and clamour by a hasty and indiscri-

* We conceive that few Christians in the world would have approved of the statement in Rom. xiv. if it had not been contained in the inspired volume.

† Exod. iv. 18.

‡ 2 Kings vii. 2, 17.

§ Josh. xxii. 9—34.

minate avowal of them in public!* It is thus that we should act with all possible circumspection, not only avoiding evil, but "abstaining as much as possible from the very appearance of it;"† and not only doing good, but endeavouring to prevent "our good from being evil spoken of."‡]

The import of the answer given to it—

[This answer is not to be understood as a connivance at what was evil, but as an acknowledgment that Naaman might expect the divine blessing whilst pursuing the conduct he had proposed. Can we imagine that Naaman at that moment saw the thing to be evil, and yet desired a dispensation to commit it? Did he, at the very moment that he was rejecting all false gods, and acknowledging Jehovah as the only true God, and determining to build an altar to Jehovah in his own country, and desiring earth from Jehovah's land to build it upon, did he *then*, I say, at *that* moment ask for a licence to play the hypocrite! and can we suppose that he would confess such an intention to Elisha, and ask *his* sanction to it? or can we imagine that Elisha, knowing this, would approve of it, or give an evasive answer, instead of reprobating such impiety? Assuredly not: the request itself, as made on that occasion, must of necessity have proceeded from an upright mind; and the prophet's concession is an indisputable proof, that the request, made under those particular circumstances, was approved by him. Elisha saw that Naaman was upright: he knew that the bowing or not bowing was a matter of indifference in itself; and that, where it was not done as an act of dissimulation, nor was likely to be mistaken by others as an act of worship, it might be done with a good conscience; more especially as it was accompanied with a public disavowal of all regard for idols; and arose only out of the accidental circumstance of the king leaning on his hand at those seasons. In this view of the subject, the prophet did not hesitate to say to him, "Go in peace."]

Such, we are persuaded, was the concession made. Let us now proceed to consider,

II. The instruction to be gathered from it—

The more carefully we examine this concession, the more instructive will it be found. We may learn from it,

1. How to determine the quality of doubtful actions—

[Many actions, such as observing of holy days, or eating meats offered to idols, are indifferent in themselves, and may be good or evil, according to circumstances. Two things, then, are to be inquired into, namely, *The circumstances under which they are done*; and, *the principles from which they flow*.

Had Naaman acted from a love to the world, or from a fear of man, his conduct would have been highly criminal: or, if by accommodating himself to the notions of the king he would have cast a stumbling-block before others, he would have sinned in doing it: but *with his views*, and *under his circumstances*, his conduct was wholly unexceptionable.

In this sentiment we are confirmed by the conduct of St. Paul. St. Paul, when taking Timothy with him as a fellow-labourer, circumcised him in order to remove the prejudices of the Jews, who would not otherwise have received him on account of his father being a Greek: but, when required to circumcise Titus, he refused, and would on no account give way; because a compliance in that case was demanded as a necessary conformity with the Mosaic law, which was now abolished. In both these cases he acted right, because of the difference of the circumstances under which he acted. So, when he "became all things to all men," he acted right, as well in conforming to legal observances as in abstaining from them, because his principle was right: § whilst Peter, on the contrary, sinned in a very grievous manner by conforming to the Jewish prejudices, because he acted from fear, and not from love. We do not mean

* Gal. ii. 2.

† 1 Thess. v. 22.

‡ Rom. xiv. 16.

§ Acts xxi. 22—26. and 1 Cor. ix. 19—22.

to say, that every action which proceeds from a good principle, is therefore right: for, *no principle, however good, can sanctify a bad action, though a bad principle will vitiate the best of actions*:* but an investigation of the principle from which an action flows, accompanied with an attention to the circumstances under which it is done, will serve as the best clew whereby to find what is really good, and to distinguish it from all specious and delusive appearances.]

2. How to act in doubtful cases—

[Circumstances must sometimes arise, wherein it is difficult to draw the precise line between good and evil: and in all such cases we shall do well to consult those, whose deeper knowledge, and exalted piety, and more enlarged experience qualify them for the office of guiding others. We are ourselves liable to be biassed by passion or interest; and are therefore oftentimes too partial judges in our own cause. Another person, divested of all such feelings, can generally see more clearly where the path of duty lies. We shall always therefore do well to distrust ourselves, and to take advice of others:† but, above all, we should take counsel of the Lord. He has promised, that “the meek he will guide in judgment, the meek he will teach his way:” and, though we are not to expect a voice from heaven to instruct us, or a pillar of fire to go before us, yet may we hope for such an influence of his Spirit as shall rectify our views, and be, *in effect*, an accomplishment of that promise, “Thou shalt hear a voice behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it, when ye turn to the right hand, and when ye turn to the left.”‡]

If, after much deliberation we cannot make up our minds, it is best to pause, till we see our way more clear. The commandments given us by God himself on this point, are very express: “Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind:” “Happy is the man who condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth; for he that doubteth is damned (condemned) if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith, is sin.”§ But, if we are upright in our minds, and inquire of others, not to get a sanction to our own wishes, but to obtain direction from the Lord, we shall certainly not be left materially to err; and for the most part, we shall at all events enjoy the “testimony of our own consciences, that with simplicity and godly sincerity we have had our conversation in the world.”||]

3. How to deal with tender consciences—

[The prophet did not begin to perplex the mind of Naaman with nice distinctions; but, seeing the integrity of his heart, encouraged him to proceed; not doubting but that, as occasions arose, God himself would “guide him into all truth.” Thus should we also deal with young converts:¶ we should feed them with milk, and not with meat, which, on account of their unskilfulness in the word of righteousness, they would not be able to digest.** There may be many things proper for them both to know and do at a future period, which, under their present circumstances, need not be imparted, and are not required. We should therefore deal tenderly towards them, being careful not to lay upon them any unnecessary burthen, or exact of them any unnecessary labours; lest we “break the bruised reed, and quench the smoking flax:” our endeavour rather must be to “lift up the hands that hang down, and to strengthen the feeble knees, and to make straight paths for their feet, that the lame may not be turned out of the way, but may rather be healed.”†† This was our Lord’s method ‡‡ — — and an attention to it is of infinite importance in all who would be truly serviceable in the Church of Christ.]

* See Haggai ii. 12, 13.

† Isai. xxx. 21.

¶ Rom. xiv. 1.

†† Heb. xii. 12, 13.

† See how the church of old acted, Acts xv. 1, 2.

§ Rom. xiv. 5, 22, 23.

|| 2 Cor. i. 12.

** John xvi. 12. 1 Cor. iii. 2. Heb. v. 11—14.

‡‡ Matt. ix. 14—17.

Lest this subject be misunderstood, we shall conclude with answering the following QUESTIONS :

1. May we ever do evil that good may come ?

[No: to entertain such a thought were horrible impiety ; and if any man impute it to us, we say with St. Paul, that "his damnation is just."* But still we must repeat what we said before, that things which would be evil under some circumstances, may not be so under others ; and that whilst the question itself can admit of no doubt, the application of it may ; and we ought not either to judge our stronger, or despise our weaker, brethren, because they do not see every thing with our eyes ;† for both the one and the other may be accepted before God, whilst we for our uncharitableness are hateful in his sight.‡]

2. May we from regard to any considerations, of ease or interest act contrary to our conscience ?

[No: conscience is God's vicegerent in the soul, and we must at all events obey its voice. We must rather die than violate its dictates. Like Daniel and the Hebrew youths, we must be firm and immovable. If a man err, it will never be imputed to him as evil that he followed his conscience, but that he did not take care to have his conscience better informed. We must use all possible means to get clear views of God's mind and will ; and, having done that, must then act according to our convictions, omitting nothing that conscience requires, and allowing nothing that conscience condemns. The one endeavour of our lives must be to "walk in all good conscience before God," and to "keep a conscience void of offence towards God and man."§]

3. May we on any account forbear to confess Christ ?

[No: we must shew, before all, our love to the God of Israel, and our communion with his people. In every place where we go, we must erect an altar to our God and Saviour. "If on any account we are ashamed of him, he will be ashamed of us ;" and, "if we deny him, he will deny us." Nevertheless we are not called to throw up our situations in life, because there is some difficulty in filling them aright : we are rather called to approve ourselves to God in those situations, and to fill them to the glory of his name. We must indeed take care that we are not led into any sinful compliances in order to retain our honours or emoluments ; but we must avail ourselves of our situations to honour God, and to benefit mankind.]—Pp. 493—499.

As further instances of Mr. Simeon's inferiority in his *hermeneutical* capacity, the Israelites are justified for "*plundering*" the Egyptians, although the meaning of that passage has been long since set at rest by reference to the original, and to oriental customs ;§ Ehad and Jael are justified in their treachery,|| on no better ground than that God is said to have raised up the former (an expression applied to the enemies as well as deliverers of the Israelites),¶ and the vindication of the latter rests on a very obscure verse in a somewhat intricate poem.**

One particular we would notice as characteristic of this work ; the rather, as we fear it has too much been the practice with the clergy

* Rom. iii. 8.

† Rom. xiv. 3—6.

‡ Rom. xiv. 10, 18.

§ Disc. CCLXIII.

|| Ibid. and Disc. CCLXIV.

¶ See Ezek. xxiii. 22. Amos vi. 14. Habak. i. 6.

** Judg. v. 24. Except this verse, there is not a word in Scripture which intimates the slightest approval of Jael's act. The rendering in our translation is doubtful, for more reasons than we can specify in a note. With regard to the Egyptians, it is beyond dispute that the pretended loan was a *gift*. Mr. Simeon's admissions afford the infidel an irresistible advantage.

already, and the influence of Mr. Simeon's writings may tend to confirm it. This is, a *marked* abstinence from reference to the *sin of schism*. The subject is considered delicate ground, and likely to give offence; and therefore many clergymen abstain from it in the pulpit. But if offence must never be given, many topics of supreme importance must never be touched in *some* congregations. To give no *needless* offence is, indeed, a sacred duty; but here the duty ends. "All the counsel of God" must be declared, whether men will hear, or whether they will forbear. If schism be the sin which our Church, in deprecating it in her Liturgy, would seem to consider it, the people should be taught what it is, and its sinfulness. Neither this, nor any other subject, should be *obtruded*; but it should have its place among the other topics of Christian preaching; and most especially, when a text is taken which bears directly upon it, that text should never be distorted to conciliate supposed prejudices. We say, *supposed*; for we do not really believe that ordinary congregations have any especial prejudices on the subject. Mr. Simeon's attachment to his Church is beyond all question; we have shewn it to be so, were that necessary; and yet do we find him, on occasions where no doubt can exist what line should be taken, frittering away the most awful examples and warnings of Scripture. The sermon on Numb. xvi. 38, is admirable; it was written, apparently, when radicalism first assumed a consistency and an attitude; so applied, it is excellent; but it scarcely glances at the real character of the scripture transaction, a separation from the ordinances of a heaven-ordained Church, for ordinances and a priesthood of man's contriving. So too in that on Judges xvii. 13, where a defection from the true priesthood and church ended in the most frightful impieties, the whole transaction is applied to a totally different subject. This is not ingenuous, nor does it manifest that vigorous disregard to human consequences which should characterize the proceedings of a Christian minister, wherever he feels the Scripture rock beneath him.

We have thus endeavoured fairly to discharge our critical duty by a work, respecting which all will be prepared to agree that it is one of the noblest offerings that consecrated hand ever laid on the altar. Long may the author live to witness its celebrity and utility—and may it prove a jewel in a brighter crown than that of earthly fame, when he can no longer enjoy what his work will assuredly realize, the praise of latest generations.

LITERARY REPORT.

The Conformity of the Church of England in her Ministry, Doctrine, and Liturgy, to the Apostolic Precept and Pattern. A Sermon, delivered on Sunday Evening, Dec. 15, 1833, in the Church of the United Parishes of St. Edmund the King and Martyr, and St. Nicholas Acons, Lombard-street: to which is added, an Address, delivered on Sunday Morning, Dec. 22, 1833, previously to reading the Thirty-nine Articles. By THOMAS HARTWELL HORNE, B.D. of St. John's College, Cambridge; Rector of the said Parishes, and Prebendary of St. Paul's. Published at the unanimous Request of the joint Vestry of the Parishioners. London: Cadell. Pp. 53.

THE object of Mr. Horne in this work, has been to exhibit a "plain illustration of the principles of that Church," of which he is so distinguished and exemplary a minister. He proves that—

1. The ministry of our Church is conformable to the Apostolic pattern.

2. The doctrines which she propounds, are founded on Holy Scripture alone. And, that

3. Her Liturgy, equally with her ministry and doctrines, is derived from the same pure and holy sources.

Each of these propositions, Mr. Horne has maintained in a masterly style; and brought forward those arguments, which his extensive and unrivalled knowledge of Biblical literature has furnished, to the entire discomfiture of the enemies of the Established Church.

The Address, previous to the reading the Thirty-nine Articles, must, we should imagine, have the effect of rendering that, which is ordinarily considered a mechanical piece of business, to be regarded as *truly* a religious duty; and the Appendix forms a complete *Church of England Manual*, which is rendered doubly valuable, from the testimonies of Non-

Episcopalians in favour of Episcopacy and the Liturgy of the Church of England. These we would willingly have transferred to our pages, had not the pressure of matter of deep temporary interest prevented us: as it is, we recommend all our readers, both lay and clerical, who are desirous of furnishing themselves with defensive armour when attacked by the host of Non-episcopalians and Deists, Fifth-monarchy-men and Independents, Baptists and Free-thinkers, to draw from this depot the sword of Truth, wherewith to confound such bitter assailants.

Ecclesiastical Establishments not inconsistent with Christianity; with a particular View to some leading Objections of the Modern Dissenters. By WILLIAM HULL. London: Rivingtons. Pp. vi. 67.

A PAMPHLET of considerable value, from the temperate manner in which the arguments in favour of the Church are brought forward; and the proofs adduced, that the fall of the Establishment would only be a prelude to the destruction of the empire.

Sermons on the leading Principles and practical Duties of Christianity. By PHILIP NICHOLAS SHUTTLEWORTH, D.D., Warden of New College, Oxford, and Rector of Foxley, Wilts. Vol. II. London: Rivingtons. Oxford: Parker. 1834. 8vo. Pp. xi. 510.

To the observations with which we introduced our review of the former volume of Dr. Shuttleworth's *Sermons*, (CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCE, Vol. X. p. 201. April, 1828), we have nothing to add in announcing the publication of the second. The object of the author is the same, and the style and manner is well adapted to its promotion; and we cordially congratulate the members of the university, both

young and old, in the advantages to be derived from the delivery of such discourses from the pulpit of St. Mary's. Fourteen sermons are comprised in the present volume; from which, if one can be preferred above another, we would select the fourth, on the character of Felix, as a most masterly specimen of Christian eloquence.

A Discourse on the Liberty of Prophecy; shewing the Unreasonableness of prescribing to other men's Faith, and the Iniquity of persecuting differing Opinions. By JEREMY TAYLOR, D. D., Chaplain in Ordinary to King Charles the First, and some time Lord Bishop of Down and Connor. With an Introductory Essay by the Rev. R. CATTERMOLÉ, B. D. London: Hatchard. 1834. 12mo. Pp. xxxix. 378. [Sacred Classics, No. I.]

FROM the Reformation downwards, the English Divines have held a high rank in the literary history of the country; and we know of no greater benefit which could have been conferred upon the public, than the collection of their best productions into a series like that, of which the present beautiful little volume forms the commencement. Some two or three libraries of divinity, upon the current popular plan, are already in the course of publication; but the sacred classics, whether as regards their intrinsic value or their moderate cost, are fully entitled to a share of the patronage which has lately been bestowed upon similar undertakings. The editors have selected an admirable work to begin with. Jeremy Taylor lived in the age of intolerance, and was himself a severe sufferer from its effects; so that while he felt for himself, he was led by his gentle and charitable spirit to send forth a word of advice for the instruction of others, which in these times is equally as seasonable as in the days of trouble in which it was elicited. Mr. Cattermole, in his pleasing "Introductory Essay," thus states the general principle upon which the "Liberty of Prophecy" is based:—

"As truth on all minor dogmas of religion is uncertain, and of small moment in its bearings upon the conduct of men, while peace and charity are things of undoubted certainty and importance, our desire to obtain the former ought to yield to the necessity of securing the latter; and every one, for the good of the community at large, ought to tolerate the differences of all others, while in turn he receives toleration for his own. But as it is indispensable somewhere to draw the line—as some standard of truth must be acknowledged, unless men were to rush into boundless anarchy, or sink into mere indifference of opinion, he proposed the confession of the Apostles' creed, as the test of orthodoxy, and condition of union and communion among Christians."—Pp. xix. xx.

In illustration of this principle, the excellent Bishop concludes his discourse with the subjoined story, which is found in the Rabbinical writings:—

"When Abraham sat at his tent door, according to his custom, waiting to entertain strangers, he espied an old man stooping and leaning on his staff, weary with age and travel, coming towards him, who was an hundred years of age; he received him kindly, washed his feet, provided supper, and caused him to sit down; but observing that the old man ate and prayed not, nor begged for a blessing on his meat, asked him why he did not worship the God of heaven? The old man told him he worshipped the fire only, and acknowledged no other God; at which answer Abraham grew so zealously angry, that he thrust the old man out of his tent, and exposed him to all the evils of the night, and an unguarded condition. When the old man was gone, God called to Abraham, and asked him where the stranger was? He replied, I thrust him away because he did not worship thee. God answered him, I have suffered him these hundred years, although he dishonoured me, and couldst thou not endure him one night, when he gave thee no trouble? Upon this, saith the story, Abraham fetched him back again, and gave him hospitable entertainment and wise instruction. 'Go thou and do likewise,'

and thy charity will be rewarded by the God of Abraham."—Pp. 377, 378.

We trust that the work will be conducted throughout with the judgment exhibited at the commencement. The next two volumes are well chosen. They will contain Cave's exquisite "Lives of the Apostles," of which we shall hope to speak, when they are complete.

The Arians of the Fourth Century; their Doctrines, Temper, and Conduct, chiefly as exhibited in the Councils of the Church, between A. D. 325 and A. D. 381. By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, M.A. *Fellow of Oriel College.* London: Rivingtons. 1833. 8vo. Pp. xi. 425.

HAD we not been over the ground which the author has traversed in the production of the present volume, we should readily have availed ourselves of his labours, for the purpose of presenting our readers with a concise view of the rise and progress of Arianism, till the period of its decline after the Council of Constantinople. Our readers, however, are in possession of a view, in this month's paper on the "Christian Sects;" and we must, therefore, be content to recommend those, who wish to pursue the subject more in detail than is consistent with the plan of a popular sketch, to have recourse to the more recondite pages of Mr. Newman. His work was originally written for the "Theological Library;" but we think him right in giving it to the world in an independent form, as the nature of its inquiries are certainly little fitted for the objects of that publication.

The Works of Hannah More. London: Fisher and Jackson. Vol. I. 12mo. 1834. Pp. 286.

THE first two volumes of a very elegant edition of this admirable writer's works have appeared. A portrait of Mrs. More (an exquisite resemblance) adorns the first volume, and a view of Barleywood, her late residence, the second. These are, we understand,

to be succeeded by views of Wrington Church (with Mrs. More's grave), Cowslip Green, &c. &c. A succinct and lively memoir is prefixed.

The work is got up uniformly with the late editions of Miss Edgeworth and Lord Byron. We sincerely wish the Publishers success, and heartily recommend their undertaking to the patronage of our friends, who, we apprehend, are all among the admirers of the illustrious authoress.

Medulla Conciliorum. Oxford: Parker. London: Rivingtons. 8vo. 1833. Pp. 92.

THIS little book is very aptly intitled. It is the condensed essence of all the councils held in the British isles for eleven hundred years. It is astonishing how the thing can be done so concisely and yet so clearly. The whole book does not reach 100 pages. Judicious distribution seems to be the secret. There are nine chapters, treating separately various important subjects; with an Appendix. The second, (de antiquâ potestate Papæ in Angliæ) with the extracts in the Appendix, sufficiently proves the novelty of the Pope's claim to supremacy. We would recommend to our able contemporary of the Protestant Journal a notice of the *Psalterium Mariæ*, *Bibliæ Mariæ*, &c. cited in Cap. IX. and Append. D. The monstrous blasphemy of these things (sufficient indeed to recommend them to the Irish Board of Education) is a complete refutation of the modern sophism that Papists only *invoke*, but do not *adore*, the Virgin. Mr. Hart, we take leave to observe, ought to write wholly in Latin, or wholly in English. The mixture is very bad.

Reading in Science; being an Explanation of some of the most interesting Appearances and Principles in Natural Philosophy, expressed in simple language, and illustrated by familiar examples. London: Parker. Pp. 404.

THE want of a knowledge of things, and of the rationale of every-day

appearances, has long been, and is still felt in every grade of society. This is a point in which our systems of education are lamentably deficient. A partial improvement has, we know, been effected, but much, very much remains to be done; in the accomplishment of which the "Readings in Science" will be found of extensive service. Though admirably adapted to the comprehension of such young persons as occupy the higher stations of our schools, it claims a more exalted character than that of a school-book. It develops in a popular form the operation of scientific principles, and will thus be found to throw much light on the studies of those who are entering on the pursuit of mathematical honours at the universities. Nor would it, though science is seldom favoured with a place on the shelves of a fashionable cabinet, be found dull company for any lady who aims at the acquisition of more worthy, and at the same time far more novel information than can be obtained from the flimsy productions of novel-writers.

A Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Exeter, examining the distinctive Characters of the Calvinists and the Arminian Sectarists; and proposing to his Lordship a Scheme of Coalition between the Wesleyans and the Church of England. By the Rev. R. POLWHELE. Truro: Hearn. London: Longman and Co. 1834. Pp. 47.

WE have read this pamphlet with peculiar attention, as well from the nature of the proposition it contains, as coming from the pen of its venerable and talented author; but still we remain unconvinced of the practicability of the scheme laid down. From the knowledge we have of Dissenters—and it is not a little—we are convinced that to meet their wishes, nothing less than a transformation of the whole discipline, and part of the doctrines, of our Church will suffice. Moreover, the democratic spirit which is so essentially connected with their system, will never suffer the Dissenters to submit to the ecclesiastical "powers

that be." This we have heard was expressed in a circular which the Wesleyans published about four years since, and which was almost as quickly withdrawn. Besides, for a Bishop to be occasionally making his selection for ordination from among Wesleyan Preachers, appears to us something like a premium for lay preaching, which is to act as a stepping-stone for "entering by the window." Indeed our opinion is, that no class of Dissenters will be brought over in a body to our excellent Church; but that they must gradually be convinced both of the sin of schism, and of the numerous evils, which Mr. James, of Birmingham (a dissenting teacher) has so clearly proved to be inherent in the system of Dissent. To effect a coalition, the Church will have to give up every thing, while Dissent will give up nothing.

The Holy Bible, arranged in Historical and Chronological Order, in one connected History, in the Words of the authorized Translation. By the Rev. G. TOWNSEND, M.A., Prebendary of Durham. New Edition. London: Rivingtons. 1834. 8vo. Pp. 1464.

THIS work is so well known that any commendation of ours must be almost superfluous. He who would understand Scripture in the best way in which it is to be understood, *i. e.* from a connected view of relative passages, must possess himself of this book. So highly do we think of it, that we have placed it in our forthcoming Theological Lists, as indispensably necessary to the student. The present edition is comparatively reasonable; and the only difference between this and the edition in four volumes is, that the notes are somewhat abridged.

The Articles of the Church of England, with Scripture Proofs. Fifth Edition. London: Seeley. 12mo. Pp. 48.

A USEFUL little book, but would be greatly improved if each copy were accompanied with a pair of spectacles to assist the purchaser in reading the proofs given.

SERMON FOR EASTER-DAY MORNING.

1 Cor. v. 7, 8.

Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us : therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness ; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.

IN these words the Apostle, we see, clearly alludes to that important solemnity of the Jewish religion,—the Passover,—of which we have just heard an account in the first Lesson for this morning's service. But first, let us inquire why it was that the Apostle addressed these words to the Corinthians.

And here, then, we must understand that Corinth, the city in which those to whom the Apostle was writing were dwelling, was at that period one of the most flourishing, powerful, and populous cities of Greece ; and as a natural consequence of this, its inhabitants were most luxurious, licentious, and profligate : they were also at the same time great admirers of the refined philosophy, and boasted wisdom, for which the orators of Greece were then famous.

This city, St. Paul, some time before, had himself visited ; he had remained there about a year and a half : and on his departure he had left amongst the people of the city the blessing of a Christian Church. It appears, however, that after the members of that Church had lost the advantage of the Apostle's presence and superintendence, their old affection for the vain philosophy of their former teachers had in some measure returned ; and, by giving them a distaste for the plain and simple preaching of the ministers of the gospel, had produced amongst them the most bitter contentions, and the most unhappy divisions : whilst from the influence of their former habits of profligacy not being properly subdued, and probably from a too free intercourse with their heathen fellow-citizens, a most disgraceful laxity of morals had been introduced into the community.

On hearing of these distressing circumstances, St. Paul addressed to the Corinthian Church the Epistle from whence my text is taken. In the course of that valuable writing, he solemnly charged them with their crimes, severely condemned their contentious spirit and uncharitable divisions, and with all the authority of an Apostle of Christ, called upon them to put away from amongst them the evil of their doings.

To lead them to enter *at once* on this great work of reformation, was clearly his object, when, in the words before us, he reminded them that " Christ, as our Passover, had been sacrificed for them ;" and urged them "*therefore* to keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

We shall however feel the force of these words more fully, if we call to mind some of the chief parts of the great Jewish solemnity to which he thus refers, as it is described by Moses in the twelfth chapter of Exodus.

That Festival was, we know, established by the Almighty himself amongst his people Israel, in remembrance of his having delivered their first-born from death, and themselves from slavery, in the land of Egypt. On the night in which the Angel of the Lord was to come down to destroy the first-born of the Egyptians, and to pass over the houses of the people of the Lord, the Israelites were commanded, each family of them which consisted of a sufficient number, to slay a lamb without blemish, and to sprinkle some of its blood upon the door-posts of their houses, that it might be a token to the destroying Angel to *pass over* their dwellings. Moreover, after having so done, they were then, with their whole family, to eat of the lamb which they had slain. But, especially, on pain of their being cut off from amongst the people of the Lord, they were to partake of the lamb only with bread which was *unleavened*; that is, bread composed of dough without any thing mixed with it to make it rise or ferment. (Exod. xii.) Such was the ordinance of the Passover, as the people of Israel were commanded to observe it the night of their deliverance out of Egypt. But it was also enjoined by the Almighty, that it should be afterwards celebrated by them as a continual remembrance of that deliverance for ever. The divine commandment was to this effect: "Ye shall observe this thing for an ordinance to thee and thy sons for ever."—"And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, What mean you by this service? that ye shall say: It is the *sacrifice* of the Lord's *Passover*, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians, and delivered our houses." (Exod. xii. 24—27.) And again: "Observe the month of Abib, and keep the Passover unto the Lord: for in the month of Abib the Lord thy God brought thee forth out of Egypt by night. Thou shalt therefore *sacrifice the Passover* unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and the herd, in the place which the Lord shall choose to place his name there. Thou shalt eat *no leavened bread* with it: that thou mayest remember the day when thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt, all the days of thy life." (Deut. xvi. 1—3. See also Levit. xxiii. 5, 6.) And according to these injunctions we find, from the history of the Jewish people, that they continued, generation after generation, thus to celebrate the Passover. Moreover, it should be remarked, that our blessed Lord himself appears regularly to have kept this holy ordinance during his sojourn upon earth; going up, as we read, to Jerusalem for the purpose, according to the custom of the Feast.

It is evident, then, what St. Paul alluded to when he wrote the words of my text to the Corinthians: and we can scarcely fail to discern why he styles the Lord Jesus Christ "our Passover," which had been "sacrificed for us." For be it remembered, that it was at this very period—at the season of the Passover, that He—the Lamb of God—was slain upon the Cross. In those portions of the gospels which record the later scenes of his life on earth, we find it related, that when the Feast of the Passover drew near, he went up to Jerusalem with his disciples for the last time; and when all things were prepared, as he had directed, then we behold him in one of the most interesting periods of his history, eating the Passover in their company; and afterwards instituting that most blessed ordinance of his religion—the Lord's Supper—as a remembrance of his death and passion which he was just

about to accomplish. It is however very remarkable, that all this took place the evening before the usual and appointed day for the celebration of the Passover. On this occasion our blessed Lord, with his disciples, ate this his last Passover before the rest of the Jewish people; and no doubt for this plain reason, because it was the divine will that the great Christian Sacrifice,—of which all the Jewish sacrifices and offerings were only types, as they are called; that is, images or representations, of the great Christian Sacrifice, which was to do away all those Jewish sacrifices for ever,—might be offered on the cross precisely at the very time of the day when the great Jewish sacrifice of the Passover was appointed and accustomed to be kept. Christ, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world;—Christ, the Lamb without spot, and without blemish, was offered up a sacrifice for sin upon the cross, just at the very hour of the day, the ninth, when the whole Jewish people began to slay the paschal lamb, that they might sacrifice the Passover, and keep the feast of unleavened bread.* This of itself must be amply sufficient to mark the extreme propriety of the Apostle's allusion in my text. But this point will appear in a yet still stronger light, if we bear in mind another consideration. There are very convincing reasons to be drawn from other parts of the Epistle, as some of the ablest commentators on the passage have observed, for believing that it was written near the time of the Jews' Passover.†

And in this view how greatly is the force of the Apostle's exhortation increased! For in this view it is almost impossible not to conclude that when he alluded to the Passover, and coupled his mention of that rite with a reference to the sacrifice of Christ's death, he pointed to that season of the year as one in which Christians might with peculiar propriety be called on to celebrate the remembrance of their Lord's sacrifice and death on the cross. In this view also, when he speaks of their keeping "the feast," it is almost impossible not to feel that he referred to that most blessed feast which our Lord had ordained in remembrance of his death and passion, the Lord's supper, which we know the early Christians were accustomed to keep and observe with the greatest reverence, especially on every returning Lord's day:‡ and when, moreover, he exhorted them to join in that feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with

* Our blessed Lord was placed on the cross at the third hour of the day, (Mark xv. 15.) which is, according to our division of the twenty-four hours, at nine in the morning. "From the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land until the ninth hour." (Matt. xxvii. 45.) And about the ninth hour, *our three in the afternoon*, Jesus "bowed his head and gave up the ghost." (John xix. 30.) Josephus, the well-known Jewish historian, tells us that the paschal lamb was killed by his countrymen between the ninth and eleventh hours of the day, that is, from three o'clock in the afternoon till even. — See Beausobre, and Horne's Introduction, Vol. III.

† Paley, in his *Horæ Paulinæ*, chap. iii. No. 12. in which he quotes Dr. Benson. See also Horne's Introduction, Vol. III. part iii. chap. iv. : and Macknight, *in loc.*

‡ "At the first commencement of Christianity (says Bishop Jer. Taylor), the whole assembly of faithful people communicated every day; and this lasted in Rome and Spain until the time of St. Jerome; then, by reason of a declining piety and the intervening of secular interests, it came to once a week; and yet that was not every where strictly observed: a while after it came to once a month; then to once a year; then it fell from that, too, till all the Christians in the West were commanded to communicate every Easter."—Vol. III. p. 313.

the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth, we can then have no doubt that he was exhorting them by their faith in their crucified Redeemer; that as the Israelites of old put away from them all leaven out of their houses before the feast of the Passover, so should they, before the return of that season so memorable to them as Christians, put away from themselves all that spirit of malice, contention, and division—all that unholiness of practice which had spread like leaven through their community; and so all be prepared to unite together in one body, with their minds purified by a genuine love of the truth, and their hearts sanctified by a sincere spirit of penitence, holiness, and brotherly love; and join in partaking of the bread broken, and the wine poured out, in remembrance of *his* death and resurrection whose body was torn upon the cross, and his blood poured forth for the sake of sinful man and his salvation.*

With these remarkable considerations placed before us, can we fail to perceive the force and beauty of the Apostle's address to his Corinthian brethren? Surely it is impossible. Neither, on the other hand, should we close our observations without marking the extreme propriety with which our Church has given to the words of my text so conspicuous a place in the service of this day.

To make this, however, a little more clear, let us call to mind the purpose for which we are more immediately met together on this occasion. On every Lord's day we are indeed invited, not only to rest from our daily works and to keep one day in seven holy unto the Lord our God, but, according to the example of the inspired Apostles and primitive Christians, to celebrate the resurrection of our blessed Saviour from the dead: and most assuredly it is very meet and right to do so; for, let us consider the immense importance to us of that great event. The *resurrection* of Christ is no less than the sealing and confirming of our redemption and deliverance through the *death* of Christ. Deprived of this, we should be without the best evidence which we have, that the offering of himself for us was accepted of our offended God: without this, we are assured in Scripture, that the blessed effects of that costly sacrifice would have been entirely lost. Had Christ remained in the grave for ever, we should have been as much ruined as if he had never died; all faith, and consequently all hope, founded in his precious blood-shedding, would have been utterly vain. "If Christ be not risen," says the Apostle to these same Corinthians (1 Cor. xv. 14, 17, 18), "then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain; ye are yet in your sins: then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." But, thanks be to God! we need have no doubt upon this vitally important point; for it is certain that "Christ is risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept" (1 Cor. xv. 20). *Now* we know, therefore, that the sacrifice of Christ's death has been accepted by the Almighty; *now* we may believe that he hath "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (Heb. ix. 26.); *now* we may rest assured that our faith, if it be a right and saving faith, will not be in vain: well may

* For a knowledge of the scrupulous exactness with which the modern Jews observe this part of the Passover, see Allen's *Modern Judaism*. See also Horne's *Introduction*, on the Passover, Vol. III.

we then most thankfully remember the resurrection as well as the death of our Redeemer! and as it was on the first day of the week—the day which therefore received from the early Christians the name of the Lord's day (Rev. i. 10.)—that our Lord rose from the dead, we are bound to call that glorious event to our remembrance, particularly on the return of each Lord's day. But if there should be one day in the year, as I am well persuaded there should, in which we should be invited to commemorate the resurrection with more than ordinary reverence, it is on this day on which we are now assembled, Easter-day.*

For, remember, that as it was at this season of the year,† at the moveable feast of the Passover, that Christ the Lamb of God was slain, so it was, as on this very Lord's day, that he proved, by his rising from the grave, that our Passover was really and effectually sacrificed for us, that our sins were blotted out in the blood of the Lamb, and the souls of the faithful delivered from guilt, misery, and ruin eternal.

Nor can we, I think, after all that has been said, withhold our admiration from the Church of England for having fixed on this day as that, above all others, on which her children should partake in the holy feast of the Lord's supper;‡ enjoining that every parishioner should communicate, at the least three times in the year, of which Easter-day shall be one.

Let me, then, as her minister, entreat you, my brethren, who are here assembled for the purpose of celebrating one of the greatest and most joyful festivals of the Christian Church, to follow her directions, at least on this day. And in what language can I better address you than in those words of Scripture which she has herself put into my mouth? Brethren, as we believe that "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

In pressing these words on your minds, and recommending the precept they contain to your practice, I consider it unnecessary, at this time, to insist at any length on the duty or the privilege of keeping this feast. If you have ever read, or heard read to you, only one of those passages of the gospels, which set before you the beautiful scene of our Lord's history when establishing that holy rite, just before he was called

* So called, it is supposed, from an old Saxon word, *oster*, to rise.

† The Christian churches of Asia, we learn from history, kept their Easter-day upon the same day on which the Jews celebrated their Passover, upon whatever day in the week it might fall: whereas other churches, and those in the west especially, partly to distinguish themselves from the Jews, and partly in honour of the Lord's day, kept their Easter on the Lord's day following the day of the Jewish Passover. This matter led to great disputes in the church, until at last it was decided, at the Great General Council of Nice (A. D. 325.), "that every where the great feast of Easter should be observed upon one and the same day; and that not on the day of the Jewish Passover, but, as had been generally observed, upon the Sunday afterwards." Wheatly on Common Prayer, p. 37. The writer of this Sermon was once asked by one of his parishioners, how it happened that Easter was moveable, whilst Christmas-day was always fixed. No doubt, from not observing the connexion of the former with the Jewish Passover, many better educated persons know as little of the reason for this as that good old man.

‡ See the sentences, commonly called rubrics (because they were originally printed in red letters), at the end of the Communion Service in the Prayer Book.

to die upon the cross for our sins, you must know and feel what a solemn obligation lies on you all, to do this in remembrance of him. If you have ever read, or heard read to you, the eleventh chapter of this Epistle, in which you are told that, "as often as you eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come," (ver. 26.) you must know and feel that it is your duty to do this as often as you conveniently can. Whilst, if you believe that "the benefits to be received thereby" are "the strengthening and refreshing of your souls by the body and blood of Christ," just "as our bodies are strengthened and refreshed by bread and wine," you can scarcely fail to observe what a great favour it is on the part of "Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, that he hath given his Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual sustenance in that holy sacrament;" and, therefore, what a high privilege it is on our part to be admitted to be "partakers of that holy table." In the early times of the gospel, before the love of many had waxed cold, Christians felt more deeply this duty, and valued more highly this privilege, than too many, alas! do in these days of lukewarmness and self-deceit. *Then* the great difficulty was to keep from the Lord's table those who were notoriously and disgracefully unfit to partake in so divine a feast; *now* the far greater difficulty is to make men feel the duty, or at least to bring them to value the privilege, of partaking in it at all. *Now* we, ministers of the gospel, are far less often called upon to warn the unfit to consider the danger of receiving the Lord's supper unworthily, than we are to warn the careless, the mistaken, and the fearful, of the danger of never receiving it. Few, in these days, very few, I trust, notorious or scandalous sinners do presume to eat of that bread and drink of that cup. But still we must bear in mind that some of this character sometimes do, for worldly purposes alone—for the sake of appearances amongst their brethren—that they may seem to be, and may be considered to be, members of the Church; or merely from habit and long-established custom, some of "the wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, may carnally and visibly press with their teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, wherein they are in no wise partakers of Christ, but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing." This ever has been, and ever will no doubt be the case, more or less, so long as men are what they are. Therefore we must, from time to time, as faithful watchmen, warn our hearers of this danger. And though I hope that there are none, on the present occasion, about to risk that danger, yet it is my duty to exhort you, my brethren, like the Jews at the feast of the Passover, to put away from you all leaven—all the old leaven of evil habits, whether of feeling, speaking, or acting—all leaven of malice, all leaven of wickedness, all leaven of deceit and hypocrisy. In the words of our Church, I would urge you that, "if any of you be a blasphemer of God, an hinderer or slanderer of his word, an adulterer, or be in malice, or envy, or in any other grievous crime, to repent you of your sins, or else to come not to that holy table."

But though I feel it my duty, in the spirit of my text, thus to warn you of the danger of presuming to receive the holy communion unworthily, I would not for the world hinder one soul who is really

penitent,—one soul who has one, the very least, the very faintest, spark of true penitence, or one grain of lively faith in their heart, from taking refuge, comfort, and strength in that heavenly and spiritual feast. No, my brethren; remember if there is danger in going to that table unworthily, there is also most awful danger in not going at all. If the Jew of old, who should presume to eat bread with leaven in it at the Passover was judged worthy of being cut off from the people of the Lord, what must have been the guilt of him, if such there ever was, who dared to despise the Divine command, and neglect or refuse to partake of the paschal lamb. Remember, that had any one family in Egypt omitted to slay their lamb and sprinkle their door-posts, according to the Divine ordinance as delivered by his servant Moses, their house would never have been saved from the vengeance of the destroying angel. And can you, then, think that the same Almighty Being, who now watches over us as constantly as he did the Israelites of old, will view with less indignation those who disregard a command as plain and positive as any he ever delivered; and *that*, moreover, delivered by his only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ? Can you imagine that he will consider *their* offence as little—their guilt as light—who wilfully separate themselves from the congregation of the faithful, place themselves without the holy communion of the saints, and cut themselves off from one of the most blessed of the means of spiritual grace, and peace, and strength, which can be enjoyed by the people of the Lord? But I cannot hope to find language of exhortation to use on this head, more appropriate than that with which our Church has supplied her ministers. In her words I would address you. “Dearly beloved brethren, unto the Lord’s supper, in God’s behalf, I bid you all that are here present; and beseech you, for the Lord Jesus Christ’s sake, that ye will not refuse to come thereto, being so lovingly called and bidden by God himself. Ye know how grievous and unkind a thing it is, when a man hath prepared a rich feast, decked his table with all kind of provision, so that there lacketh nothing but the guests to sit down, and yet they who are called (without any cause) most unthankfully refuse to come. Which of you in such a case would not be moved? Who would not think a great injury and wrong done unto him? Wherefore, most dearly beloved in Christ, take ye good heed, lest ye, withdrawing yourselves from this holy supper, provoke God’s indignation against you. It is an easy matter for a man to say, I will not communicate, because I am otherwise hindered with worldly business. But such excuses are not so easily accepted and allowed before God. If any man say, I am a grievous sinner, and therefore am afraid to come; wherefore then do ye not repent and amend? When God calleth you, are ye not ashamed to say, We will not come? When ye should return to God, will ye excuse yourselves, and say ye are not ready? Consider earnestly with yourselves how little such feigned excuses will avail before God. They that refused the feast in the gospel, because they had bought a farm, or would try their yokes of oxen, or because they were married, were not so excused, but counted unworthy of the heavenly feast. I, for my part, shall be ready; and, according to mine office, I bid you, in the name of God; I call you, in Christ’s behalf; I exhort you, as ye love your own salvation; that ye will be partakers of this holy communion.

And as the Son of God did vouchsafe to yield up his soul by death upon the cross for your salvation, so it is your duty to receive the communion in remembrance of the sacrifice of his death, as he himself hath commanded; which, if ye shall neglect to do, consider with yourselves how great injury ye do unto God, and how sore punishment hangeth over your heads for the same, when ye wilfully abstain from the Lord's table, and separate from your brethren who come to feed on the banquet of that most heavenly food."*

You see, then, my brethren, there is danger on both sides—danger to your souls in coming to the feast unworthily—danger also to your souls in not coming at all. But is it not possible to escape from both? It is possible for us all, if we will. We must keep the straight, the onward path. We must turn neither to the right hand nor the left. We must come, and come often; but we must come prepared. And how shall we be duly prepared? We must examine our lives and conversation by the rule of God's commandments; and whereinsoever we shall perceive ourselves to have offended, either by will, word, or deed, we must bewail our sinfulness, and confess ourselves to Almighty God, with full purpose of amendment of life; we must be in charity with our neighbours: but, above all, feeling that in the mercy of God, and the merits of our crucified Redeemer alone, can our pardon be found, and our strength solely in the grace of the Holy Spirit; in these, and these only, must be our trust and confidence. If this be the state of our mind in any degree, even though our repentance may not be what we could wish, and though our faith be weak, yet if they both be sincere, we shall be accepted; we shall *so* be meet partakers of that holy table. In conclusion, then, my brethren, let me once more exhort you in the words of my text, and say, "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us; therefore, now let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

D. I. E.

MISCELLANEOUS.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN SECTS.

NO. III.—ARIANISM, *continued*.

SECT. 2.—*The Arian Doctrines. —The Council of Nice. —Decline of the Heresy.*

THE doctrines of Arius, as set forth by cotemporary writers and historians, are these:—Christ is not co-eternal with the Father, because he is begotten; he had therefore a beginning of existence, (*ἀρχὴν ὑπάρξεως*); and there was a time when he did not exist, (*ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*). Neither was he co-equal or consubstantial with the Father, but was

* Second Exhortation to the Holy Communion.

created out of nothing (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*), before the worlds, and in the express likeness of the Father; whence his followers were popularly called *οἱ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*, or *Euxontians*. He argued that as Son his existence depended upon the will of the Father; and maintained that as the Father was *unbegotten*, and the Son *begotten*, their essence could not be the same. At the same time he admitted the super-eminent dignity of Christ's character, as the agent employed by God in creating the universe; as, strictly speaking, the only creature of God himself; and as being indeed a *κτίσμα*, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἐν των κτισμάτων γέννημα, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἐν τῶν γεννημάτων. Such is the assertion of Arius himself, in his Epistle to Eusebius; and in the same letter he explicitly affirms that as the Son is not ἀγέννητος, so he is neither μέρος ἀγεννήτον, nor made of any existing substance; but that πρὸ χρόνων καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων, he was made by the will of God of an *unchangeable nature*, of a substance that once was not, and that before this generation he did not exist. In the other letter of Arius, and in the fragment of the Thalia still extant, his tenets are similarly expressed. But Alexander, in his circular, affirms that they included the *mutability* of the Son of God, though the contrary is clearly admitted by himself. From the subtle character of the heretic, it is probable that he either assumed or rejected this point, as it suited his purpose. That it was an undeniable consequence of his theory, is evident; and when some of his followers were asked, if the *Logos* could fall as the devil fell, they were only consistent in answering, "*Certainly he can.*"

In the synod held at Alexandria, at which sentence of excommunication was passed against Arius, it was urged, in opposition to his doctrines, that if Christ were a creature, he must have had the imperfection of a creature; his knowledge and power must have been circumscribed; and those passages of the New Testament which ascribe to the *Logos* immutability and omniscience, and the express declaration that *by him and for him* all things were made, and that *without him* nothing was created,—had no meaning. To the evidence from Scripture was added the unvarying consent of the Catholic Church, which had ever upheld the divinity of Christ as a prominent article of faith. It was accordingly determined that the Word was God, of the same substance and co-eternal with the Father. The effect of these proceedings on Arius has been already noticed; and it now appeared that the only means of counteracting the evil lay in the decision of a general council. Accordingly, in the year 325, the first (Ecumenical Council* was summoned at Nicæa, in Bithynia, for the purpose of settling the dispute. Hosius, Bishop of Corduba, one of the most eminent men of the time, was president; and the emperor himself attended their proceedings throughout. Some doubt has been entertained respecting the number of bishops who were present; but it is probable that Athanasius has

* Ecclesiastical Councils, or Synods, are of three kinds; *national*, *provincial*, or *ecumenical*. A *national council* consists of the Bishops or Clergy of a particular kingdom; a *provincial council*, of the Bishop or Clergy of a single province; at *ecumenical*, or *general councils*, delegates assemble from all parts of the Christian world (*οἰκουμένη*), to consult for the good of the universal Church. The English convocation is a *national synod*.

correctly stated it to have been 318.* Eusebius makes it, in round numbers, above 250, and Socrates above 300; but the above enumeration rests upon the further testimony of Hilary, Jerome, and in another passage of Socrates himself. Besides these Prelates, there were also assembled a considerable multitude of the Clergy, of different sentiments indeed, and congregated with different views; but it will be scarcely conceded to Gibbon, that Arians, Sabellians, and Tritheists, composed the whole assembly. The final decision of the council proves at once the orthodoxy of the majority; and whatever motives may have influenced different individuals to undertake the journey,† there must have been a predominant intention of establishing the doctrines of Christ upon a solid basis, and restoring peace to the Church.

Immediately on the opening of the council, much angry feeling was manifested, and several of the members presented written memorials to the Emperor, containing mutual accusations against each other. Instead of listening to the charges, Constantine generously burnt the papers; and, exhorting the assembled divines to concord and unanimity, ordered their appointed deliberations to proceed. Arius did not hesitate to state his opinions with unequivocal precision, to which Athanasius, then only twenty-seven years of age, replied; and the debate was carried on with much warmth, without any prospect of a speedy arrangement between the disputants. It was eventually admitted, however, that the controversy mainly turned upon the *consubstantiality* of the Father and the Son; the Arians having omitted, in a creed drawn up for them by Eusebius of Cæsarea, the terms *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας* and *ὁμοούσιος*, while they readily assented to every other title of dignity bestowed upon the Son. True it was, that the word *ὁμοούσιος*, which is of Platonic origin, would not be found in Scripture, but was well adapted to express an opposition to the leading doctrine of Arianism, that the Son is *ἐτεροούσιος*; and a variety of passages of Scripture were adduced to prove, that the Son is of the same substance with the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God. At length the tenets of Arius were authoritatively denounced, their author, as already recorded, was banished, and the doctrine of the Trinity, as it is still received in the Catholic Church, set forth in the Nicene Creed. This creed, as originally composed by *Hosius*, is thus given by Socrates, (Hist. Eccl. I. 8):—

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεόν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν. Καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ· τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, καὶ φῶς ἐκ φωτός, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ· γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί· δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰ τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ· δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα, καὶ σαρκωθέντα, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα· παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ· ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα.

* See Jortin's Hist. Eccl. Book III.

† They were conveyed to the place of meeting in public conveyances, and maintained, during the sitting of the council, at the emperor's expense.

In the conclusion, the tenets of Arians were thus explicitly anathematized, including the position of the mutability of the Son of God, which Arius seems at some time to have disavowed:—Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ὅτι ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτε ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν, ἢ τρεπτὸν, ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀναθεματίζει ἡ ἀγία καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

Having disposed of the main question for which they had been convened, the council did not separate without settling the dispute which had long unhappily existed respecting the celebration of Easter, and enacting a series of canons respecting the discipline of the Church. Their decision was immediately followed by the imperial edict, which, after assimilating the perverseness of Arius to that of Porphyry, and designating his followers by the opprobrious appellation of *Porphyrians*, condemned his books to the flames, and exiled those who refused to subscribe the synodical decree. Some of the Arian party now pretended to admit the insignificance of the point in dispute, compared with the importance of preserving the unity of the Church; and contrived, by an unworthy artifice, to avoid the alternative which awaited them. By the insertion of a single letter, the confession of faith which they presented to the council was made to represent the Son, not as *ὁμοούσιον*, of the same essence, but as *ὁμοιούσιον*, of a like essence, with the Father. For this act of duplicity Eusebius of Nicomedia was severely upbraided by one of the more honest of the party; but the majority complied with the urgency of the case, and submitted, with this reservation, to the will of the emperor.

After the death of Constantine, his three sons, who succeeded to the empire, took different sides in the Arian contest. Constantius espoused the Arians; while his brothers maintained the decrees of the council of Nice. The younger Constantine, who ruled in Gaul, sent back Athanasius to his see with every mark of respect, in accordance, as he said, with the declared intention of his father. By the death of his patron, however, the bishop was again thrown into the power of Constantius; and when the murder of Constantius, in the year 350, placed the greater part of the Western Empire under his control, his deposition was again effected with every additional circumstance of violence and injustice. He retired into the deserts of the Thebais; and there, with a price set upon his head, and suffering the most cruel privation, his courage never forsook him, nor did he relax, in the place of his seclusion, his opposition to the heretical faction. In the mean time, Constantius, not content with individual persecution, compelled or seduced many others of the Clergy into compliance; and, among the rest, the pious and exemplary Hosius, weighed down by the infirmities of a hundred years, was reluctantly persuaded to sign the Arian confession. Such proceedings had the effect of disgusting every sincere Christian; and, on the death of Constantius, the influence of the Arians sensibly decreased. Athanasius returned to his bishopric; and, though forced again to retire by the apostate Julian, he was formally reinstated by his successor *Jovian*, under whose auspices the Nicene confession was again received throughout all the western and most of the eastern provinces of the empire. In the joint reign of Valentinian and Valens, Athanasius was again

induced to withdraw from the persecution of the latter, who favoured the Arians; but the popular feeling was so strong against the party that he was speedily recalled. During his absence he had taken refuge in the sepulchre of his father. Gratian used every exertion to annihilate the Arians; and Athanasius lived to see the true doctrine of the cross established beyond the power of his enemies. He died in peace, in the year 373, and was buried in Alexandria.

Among the causes which tended to bring Arianism into disrepute, the divisions among the members of the sect were not the least influential. The different modifications of their creed were exceedingly numerous. Those who conformed to the genuine tenet of their founder, denied altogether the *consubstantiality* of the Father and the Son, and maintained that their essences were totally distinct and dissimilar. Hence they were called also *Anomorans*; and, from one of their most eminent teachers, *Eunomians*. Between these and the *Semi-Arians*, called also *Eusebians*, from Eusebius of Nicomedia, the distinction seems to have been rather nominal than real. They communicated with the Arians; and, although they admitted the *perfect likeness* of the Father and the Son for the sake of eluding the decree of the council of Nice, they equally denied their *consubstantiality*. From this peculiarity, which seems at least to have originated in intrigue, they were denominated *Homoiousians*, in opposition to the Catholician *Homoousians*. There were also various subdivisions of this branch; among whom were the *Doulitani*, who maintained that the Son was the servant of the Father; and the *Acacians*, who simply asserted a *likeness* of the Father and the Son, without specifying a similitude of substance. Acacius, the leader of these last, afterwards retreated, and subscribed to the orthodox faith. Besides these principal denominations, into which the heresy was broken, it included also the *Aetrans*, *Psathyrians*, and various others, whom it is needless to particularize. It may be proper, however, to mention that, about the middle of the fourth century, Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople, introduced in the Arian, or rather Semi-Arian creed, a denial of the divinity of the third Person of the Trinity, whom he asserted to be *κτιστὴν*, a creature. The arguments by which he supported his opinion were precisely similar to those which the Arians employed against the divinity of the Son. His followers were also called *Pneumatomachians*.

On the accession of Theodosius the Great to the imperial dignity, he declared himself unequivocally in favour of the orthodox creed, and asserted his resolution to sanction no other religion within his dominion than that which acknowledged the essential unity of the Son with the Father and the Holy Ghost. In accordance with his view, the second (Ecumenical Council was summoned at Constantinople in 381, at which 150 bishops assembled. It was the main object of this council to confirm the decision of the council of Nice, to condemn the Macedonian heresy, which impugned the divinity and distinct personality of the Holy Spirit. From this period Arianism dwindled into complete insignificance; and, at the close of the fourth century, with the exception of a few individuals who privately professed its forsaken creed, it had literally disappeared throughout the whole extent of the Roman Empire. It survived till a later period among the Goths and Vandals, who had

overrun the western provinces; and in the fifth century had found its way, not only into Gaul, but into various parts of Asia, Africa, and Europe. The early Saxon churches seem to have been only slightly infected by it; though Bede (Lib. I. 8.) plainly intimates the existence of the heresy among them. Towards the end of the seventh century it reappeared in Italy for a short time, among the Lombards; but from that period little was heard of it, till its revival in England in the beginning of the last century. In 1531, Servetus, a Spanish physician, gave a momentary impulse to Arian opinions in the west; but he was burnt as a heretic, at the instigation of Calvin, who subsequently refuted his theory, which a few of his followers carried to Geneva. Grotius also, and Erasmus, have been accused of favouring the tenet of Arius; but the latter, at least, disavowed the charge. *Nulla hæresis, he observes, magis extincta est, quam Arianorum.*

In our next paper we shall speak of the rise and progress of Arianism in England.

OBSERVATIONS ON MR. BINNEYS ADDRESS.

MR. EDITOR, — After the able review of the Episcopo - Dissento Address of Mr. Binney, with which your readers were favoured last month, it may scarcely be thought necessary to occupy your pages with a further notice of that gentleman; but his ignorance is in reality so great, and his impudence so marvellous, that I must beg the favour of your inserting my few "Observations."

T. Binney, a few years ago, appeared before the public in the character of a biographer of a Mr. Morrel, an independent minister of the "Congregational order." Well do I remember the impression made on my mind, when I opened on the frontispiece,—a profile of the subject of the Memoir. I verily thought that we were about to read the adventures of some first-rate Bond-street exquisite, adorned with "hair erect and glasses on." Mr. Binney's hero, however, it appeared, was a martyr of the "voluntary system:"—for I found there innuendos, that the said Mr. Morrel had died of a broken-heart, in consequence of the pious treatment received from some *humble-minded* "lord-deacon" and "church-members." A perusal of the Memoir will give its readers some insight into the delectabilities of the "*in-dependent*" scheme, and confirm a charge against the "lord-deacons" and "members," advanced by a prophet of their own;—that the "*in-dependent* ministers," "in presence of some of their lay-tyrants, are only permitted to peep and mutter from the dust."*

The time which intervened between the birth of the "Biography" and that of the "Address," afforded the parent a sufficient opportunity of waxing wiser, by more closely and impartially investigating the charges which, in the former production, he had made against the Church of England. His admission, that he had advanced those charges without having sufficiently weighed them, had led some simple-hearted folks to

* James's Church Member's Guide, 1st edit. p. 60.

hope, that T. Binney would have profited by the indiscretion of a rash step. There is no standing still in the path of wisdom or of folly : and if Mr. Binney has not progressed in wisdom's way, the "Address" indicates that he has not been stationary in the way of folly.

The "Address was delivered on laying the first stone of the New King's Weigh-house." I am not certain whether the expression denotes the "Weigh-house" of "the New King," or "the New Weigh-house of the King." The solution of my doubt is immaterial. Only I wish that, if "the King's Weigh-house" is to be used for the purpose of weighing the merits or demerits of the Church, a more competent and a more honest officer than T. Binney may be appointed.

I had not proceeded through many lines of the "Address," before I discovered the same lack of common honesty that is discoverable in every dissenting publication, which impugns the Articles, Services, or Constitution of the English Church. "As we are assembled this day to lay the foundation of an edifice sacred to religion—a structure, intended for the use of a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God will be preached, and the sacraments duly administered according to Christ's ordinance." Here we have a garbled quotation from the Nineteenth Article of the Church ; but "T. Binney" found it convenient to cut the Article short. Why so ? He, probably, had some misgiving as to the compatibility of the residue of the sentence with the authority of dissenting teachers. "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."—Art. XIX. One of "all those things" is a regularly ordained and authorized ministry,—such as is not to be found in the "Congregational order."

Dissenters, when attempting to fix on the Church the charge and the odium of ruling men's conscience in matters of faith, independently of God's holy word, resort to a similar subterfuge : for they quote only a few words of the Twentieth Article,—“Of the authority of the Church.” “The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith.” This is all of this article which dissenting writers set before their readers : and the proposition, unqualified by what follows, is full to the purpose of dissenting controversialists. “The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith : and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of holy writ, yet, as it ought not to decree any thing contrary to the same, so, beside the same, ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation.” With this compare the Sixth Article : “Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation : so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.” We know not whether a “Congregational Church” does, or does not interfere “in controversies of faith ;” or whether some shorter method be or be not

adopted to settle such "controversies," by submitting to the unquestioned "authority" of some "lord-deacon," whom Mr. James, a dissenting writer, designates as "the patron of the living, the *Bible of the minister*, and the wolf of the flock," "who thinks that, in virtue of his office, his opinion is to be *law in all matters of church-government*, whether *temporal or spiritual*." *

In the "Address," Mr. Binney tells us, that "the principle of persecution was formerly common to all sects." "The Catholics persecuted the Protestants;—the Protestants, the Catholics;—and one class of Protestants, another." From the persecuting Protestants, Mr. Binney has excluded "one class,"—the Independents. This class, the zealous preachers of "civil and religious liberty," never dreamed of persecuting any other body of Christians, who might take the liberty of thinking for themselves. So Master Binney would have us opine. There are, however, some querish facts on record since the *halcyon* days of the regicide Cromwell,—the great champion of "civil and religious liberty." During the alternately usurped ascendancy of the Presbyterians and Independents under Cromwell, Episcopalians were not permitted to worship God after the manner of their forefathers, and the dictate of their own conscience; and a penalty of five pounds sterling was inflicted on any person, in whose possession THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER WAS FOUND. It was the ardent love of "civil and religious liberty," that inwardly moved the Regicide and his religious fanatics, to deprive the Clergy of their churches, their homes, and their bread, and of the means of honestly earning their daily sustenance: for they were not permitted even to keep schools for the maintenance of themselves and starving families. The same love of "civil and religious liberty" now warms and invigorates the many *christianly* publications of Dissenters,—especially those of the "Ecclesiastical Knowledge" Society, which are circulated with so great an assiduity throughout the land.

"All the evils of persecution have arisen from the notion—fundamentally false, but once universally admitted,—that religion is to be established and supported by the State."—"This has been the fruitful source of every enormity. Had Christianity never been allied to the State, persecution never could have existed or prevailed." So saith T. Binney. Now, we ask, is it at all credible, that any man, pretending to be the minister of the gospel,—an instructor of others,—and a writer of Biographies and Addresses,—can be so consummately ignorant of Church history, or so audaciously determined to pervert the truths of that history, as to venture on publishing such monstrous falsehoods as those which we have just quoted from the "Address." Was the alliance of the Church and State "the fruitful source of every enormity," whether heresy in doctrine, or persecution with fire and sword, which "existed" and "prevailed" in the first three centuries of the Church of Christ, when no such alliance existed? And in subsequent ages, and in different nations, when and where "Christianity had never been allied to the State," were the cruel immolations of the almost numberless martyrs for the truth as it is in Jesus, to be ascribed to the support

* James's Church Member's Guide, 1st edit. pp. 146, 147.

which religion derived from the State? In our own country, under the "Commonwealth," (common curse?) was the fierce persecution by ejectments, fires, and imprisonments of conscientious Episcopalians, to be attributed to the union of the Church and State, when that union was dissolved? Verily, Master Binney, thou art an accurate chronicler and ingenious reasoner. Verily, "A CALL" from comparative indigency and obscurity, to the enjoyment of some five or six hundred pounds a year, and the smiles of a metropolitan "church and congregation," has a mighty influence in *settling* some men's minds!! In that golden age of "civil and religious liberty," "rival sects reasoned against or ridiculed each other," "exhausted the resources of logic or vocabulary of reproach," (T. Binney,) until the nation, being weary and disgusted, and groaning with the burning hatred, the mutual jealousies, the fierce contentions of "rival sects" and their legitimate offspring, infidelity, sought repose beneath the shadows of those hallowed institutions which the "rival sects" had destroyed, in their love of "civil and religious liberty" under the *pious* Oliver. Facts, and reasoning from those facts, demonstrate that non-alliance of Church and State is no security against persecution,—no bulwark against pernicious heresies,—no protection to "civil and religious liberty," in the true acceptance of the term "liberty."

Mr. Binney briefly describes the difficulties with which "the founders and fathers of this church,"—the *King's Weigh-house*, "for nearly twenty years after its formation," had to contend. They "could only meet for worship in comparative secrecy; it was an object with them to be unobserved; their assembling together was illegal,—they were safe only by connivance, for they were deprived of civil security and protection." A candid writer of the persecuted state of the Episcopalians under the ascendancy of *Presbyterianism* and *Independency* in the seventeenth century, might justly adopt Mr. Binney's language, to depict the sufferings and hardships of "our ancestors" of the Church. We certainly regret that Episcopalians, when restored to their power and place, did not set before themselves an example more worthy of the Christian, than that of the furious Independents of the "Commonwealth."

We must not pass over *one* of Mr. Binney's boastings in this short "Address," that "the combined numbers of the other sects are probably the majority" in the nation: *i. e.* all the Dissenters from the Establishment, form the majority of the nation. We suppose that Mr. Binney will admit the credibility of the "Eclectic Review,"—a work, by far the most talented and impartial of all the dissenting periodicals. In that Review it has been stated, that all the Dissenters, including the Wesleyans, members and occasional hearers, do not exceed two millions. Whether two millions "form the majority" of fourteen millions, it is for Mr. Binney to decide.

The author of the "Address," presently, takes due care to extol his honesty, at the same time that he unfolds a secret which we suspect has long occupied the thoughts of Dissenters. "I could not lift my head in society, if friends and brethren were not only debarred the 'liberty of prophesying,' but were denied the privilege of committing to their fathers' sepulchre, their spiritual children, the members of another com-

munion, but whose family resting-place might be connected with ours; and still more so, if the building and the burying-ground were national property, created by taxes levied on the public, and yet restricted to the use of one denomination." Here it is insinuated, but at the expense of notorious truth, that Dissenters are refused sepulture in our church-yards. But the *gravamen* of the grievance appears, as we read further on, to be, that dissenting teachers are debarred "the liberty of prophesying" in our church-yards. Connecting Mr. Binney's sentiments with the burdens of the dissenting songs of grievances and demands, as sung at the agitating meetings of Dissenters throughout the country, we can no longer be at a loss as to the ultimate object of Dissenters. In the Dissenters' addresses to the King, an authority to enter our church-yards, with "liberty of prophesying," is requested for the dissenting teacher, on the supposition that those church-yards are national property, created by taxes levied on the public." I suppose that Mr. Binney here alludes to the few churches and church-yards, "created" by the late parliamentary grants of one-and-a-half-million. To any other churches and church-yards, his remarks cannot apply. But the "liberty of prophesying" in our church-yards by dissenting teachers, is, when abstractedly considered, a matter of no moment to the Dissenters. Its importance to them is derived from its establishing a principle on which they may step further, and claim our churches. For, concede to Dissenters the power of entering, and using, in *their own way*, our church-yards, as "national property," and what is to debar them from entering, and using, in *their own way*, our national buildings, or churches, as "national property?" On the supposition that the Legislature may concede to Dissenters their demand of admission, as co-partners and co-prophesiers with our Clergy, into our burying-grounds,—it becomes a grave question,—What will be the path of duty for the Clergy to adopt? There is, I conceive, but one of these two: either to submit to the gross innovation, and be content to be bearded and insulted within their own precincts, by dissenting teachers, and patiently await the comfort of being placed in the clerks' desks, while the Dissenter occupies the pulpit;—or quietly to withdraw from the Church, of which the fences are broken down for the admission of the wolves and greedy beasts of prey, which may roam and range from the interminable wilderness of motley sectarianism. The latter, I believe, as far as I can gather, to be in unison with the feelings of the Clergy: and it may be more consistent, than to enter into a sort of co-partnery with the heterogeneous and discordant mass of religionists.

From the "Address," I pass on to the "Appendix." Here I find, as the reviewer has noticed, a solemn charge indeed, drawn up against the Established Church. "It is with me, I confess, a matter of deep, serious, religious conviction, that the Established Church is a great national evil; that it is an obstacle to the progress of truth and godliness in the land; that it destroys more souls than it saves; and that, therefore, its end is most devoutly to be wished by every lover of God and man."—T. Binney. This is speaking out plainly; not in parables. The tiger first silently crouches in ambush, slowly approximates his unsuspecting prey, and the hideous roar after blood is heard when he thinks he is sure of seizing his victim. I leave to Mr. Binney, and his

coadjutors, the application. Binney's "conviction" of the destructive character of the Established Church, may or may not rest on evidence satisfactory to himself. But there are others, whose "conviction," resting, we doubt not, on evidence quite as valid, sets aside Mr. Binney's. I shall adduce the publicly-expressed "conviction" of one, of no mean authority with Dissenters. "He, as the Lord Mayor had also stated of himself, had not adopted the principles of that Church, of which he was the firm, the consistent, and the staunch supporter, merely from education. He had adopted her faith, after anxious thought and deep conviction, as productive of the best fruits, and contributions to holiness of conduct, and consistency of character; and he felt bound to state, that the hierarchy of the Church of England exceeded every other of which he had any knowledge, in liberality and tolerance to those of a different communion."—*Lord Brougham's Speech at the Anniversary Dinner of the Sons of the Clergy, May 21, 1831.* I must leave the Lord High Chancellor of England, and T. Binney of the "New King's Weigh-house, Eastcheap, London," to adjust the point of dispute;—observing, *en passant*, that the Lord Chancellor labours under the disadvantage of forming his "conviction" on every day's visible and tangible evidence *only*, while Mr. Binney has, it seemeth, been permitted to peep through the veil which separates this world from the world of spirits, where he recognized, in their respective states, fixed and eternal, both Churchmen and Dissenters.

My own "conviction," from what we observe as daily passing before us is, that the turbulent and turbid waters of dissent possess neither that surface which can reflect the softening and winning rays of the gospel of Christ, nor that quality which can cleanse and improve our nature in its religious, social, or political character. The bitterness and strife which are fostered by conflicting "interests" among themselves,—and the selfish end, "I will have my own way," at which each aims, sufficiently demonstrate that the Independent Scheme is not pacific. "Divisions," writes Mr. James, a Dissenting Minister at Birmingham:—"Divisions in our Churches (Independent) produce incalculable mischief, since they not only prevent the *growth* of religion, but *impair and destroy* it."—"How much ill-will and antichristian feeling,—what envies, and jealousies, and evil-speakings, commence and continue!"—"We have been accused of *wrangling* about a Teacher of Religion, till we have lost our religion *in the affray*; and the state of *MANY* of our congregations proves that the charge is not altogether *without foundation*."—"Church" (Independent) meetings become "a Court of Common Pleas, and it is *necessary to bind over to keep the peace*."—*Church Member's Guide*.^{*} Dissenters, in their writings against the Church, exhibit more acerbity, not to say ferocity, than can be discovered in the pages of the contending philosophical sects among the ancient heathens;—and so infatuated are they,—so habituated to call "good" "evil," and "evil" "good," that they mistake hatred, malice, and envy, for apostolical zeal; and approve, laud, and inculcate the endless "divisions" of dissent, for the unity and compactness of the body of Christ.

* In all references to the "Church Member's Guide," the first edition of that work is consulted. The subsequent edition was altered in paging, &c.

Mr. Binney concludes his "Appendix" with two sentences, which I hope will not be lost on any Churchman or Clergyman in the kingdom; and I recommend them to the special notice of our Girdlestones, Arnolds, &c. "Every pious, and every patriotic man, should feel that he is not permitted to be neutral. A judgment must be formed,—a side must be taken,—and every legitimate weapon appropriated and employed." So say we!

My attention to Mr. Binney's tirade was first drawn by a recommendation of it to the Clergy, which "The Times" newspaper deigned to give: "We recommend it to the Clergy, who will see in it the kind of opposition to the Church of England, which is carried on by those who are neither radical in politics, nor infidel in religion."—*Times*.

If by "radical in politics" Mr. Binney's panegyrist means *democratical* in politics, I think that a little calm investigation of the ecclesiastical polity of the Independents,—the history of the catastrophe of the Crown and the Church in the seventeenth century,—and an impartial observation of the political associates of the Dissenters in these days, will accurately determine the *political* cast of dissent. The religious regime of the Congregational System is purely *democratical*: and the form of government approved in the *religious*, appears, from analogy, desirable in the *political*, constitution. KING JAMES, who seems to have had quite as much political sagacity as his present successor on the throne of these realms,—JAMES shrewdly remarked, "No Bishop—no King." I mean not to maintain, that there is a necessary connexion between the existence of bishops and that of kings; but this I mean to say, and, doubtless, it is what JAMES meant when he uttered those words,—that the same principle of insubordination and opposition to superior authority in a religious polity, operates as much against authority in civil polity. The principle, indeed, of insubordination in both is the same, but directing its operation against different objects. In this opinion I am supported by the learned translator of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History. Speaking of the Independents of the time of Charles I. and the Commonwealth, he observes: "When we consider their religious form of government, we shall see evidently that a principle of analogy (which influences the sentiments and imaginations of men much more than is generally supposed) must naturally have led the greatest part of them (the Independents) to republican notions of civil government, they must have expected much more protection and favour from it, than from a kingly one."* The same translator quotes a note† from "Durell (whom, nevertheless, Louis du Moulin, the most zealous defender of the Independents, commends on account of his ingenuity and candour), in his *Historia Rituum Sanctæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ* (Cap. iv. p. 4.), expresses himself thus: 'Fateor, si atrocis illius Tragœdiæ tot actus fuerint, quot ludicarum esse solent, postremum fere Independentium fuisse.—Adeo ut non acute magis, quam vere, dixerit L'Es-trangius noster: REGEM primo a Presbyterianis interemtum, CAROLUM deinde ab Independentibus interfectum.' And what is the political character of those with whom dissenters coalesce in the present day? The

* Vol. V. p. 403. Note.

† P. 398.

most furious democrats, opponents of every established institution, civil or religious,—who seek the prostration of every presiding and ruling authority in the land; and who are directing their combined energies to annihilate every distinctive feature which constitutes a difference between the various grades of the community.*

If, in their political principles and proceedings, the Independents are allied to the turbulent democrats of these turbulent days, they are no less, in their religious principles, allied to those who are "infidel in religion." The partition between religious dissent and infidelity is so attenuated that an excursion from the former to the latter is easy, natural, and often imperceptible. From what is termed "Orthodoxy" in dissent, through the various grades of Socinianism, Deism, Materialism, &c. the retrogression to Atheism is natural enough. The same insubordinate spirit,—the same impatience of authority,—the same *independent, alius*, proud passion, which lead men to despise and break through salutary restraints, imposed by divine or human wisdom for the good of the whole body, in the ecclesiastical or civil polity, and to form a system by which such men may become "many masters," naturally lead men to cast off the authority, and deny the existence, of a Supreme Moral Governor, to whom man is accountable. Here, as in politics (as already stated), the principle of pride, and insubordination to human or divine authority, is the same; but, in its progress, operating against different objects, in various degrees of authority, from the least human, to the highest Divine authority. But the present combination for one object, of infidels and dissenters, must, we think, exhibit a sympathy between these combined bodies. Who have been the active propagators of the infamous Black Book, written by an ATHEIST, CONVICTED OF ROBBERY? I answer, THE DISSENTERS. Who have recommended and pushed into circulation the obscene, mendacious, and infidel trash of R. M. Beverley? I again answer, THE DISSENTERS. And it has fallen to my lot to know that, some years ago, when the infidel works of the Infidel Paine were industriously spread through the country, an "orthodox" or "evangelical" dissenting minister of the Independents, then residing in a large town in Yorkshire, did hand and recommend to his "Church," in vestry assembled, the published writings of Thomas Paine!! Of the local and personal names I am in possession. And who are the infidels which are the pest of our densely populated towns and villages,—which corrupt our youths and impede the religious and moral improvement of our respective districts? I answer from actual observation,—that they are, almost to a man, either the persons themselves, or the immediate descendants of those who had previously dissented from the Established Church.

Your readers may, probably, opine that I have bestowed too much attention on Mr. Binney's "Address" and "Appendix." It was certainly not any real merit of the *large quarto* that tempted me to notice it at all. But I wished to add a specimen of the weapons forged

* "To deny that there are seasons when a Christian may *piously* (piously!!) lift up his hand against the government of his country, would be to speak treason against the Constitution of England, which rests on the basis of the Revolution."—*Church Member's Guide*, p. 53.

and employed by dissenters in their crusade against the Church; and to excite in the breasts of all Churchmen, the Laity especially, for it concerns them and their children, more than it concerns the Clergy, a befitting solicitude for the preservation of those hallowed institutions,—hallowed by time, hallowed by tried and proved utility to the best interest of man, and hallowed and cemented by the blood of our martyred forefathers, who counted not their lives dear unto themselves, in maintaining those institutions, which dissenters, democrats, and infidels labour to destroy.

PHILALETHES.

ORGANO-HISTORICA;

Or the History of Cathedral and Parochial Organs.

NO. XI.—THE ORGAN AT ST. KATHERINE'S, REGENT'S PARK.

THE organ at this establishment formerly stood in the church of St. Katherine's, near the Tower; but was removed from thence at the demolition of that ancient hospital, to make room for the present St. Katherine's dock, &c.

In our January number we gave a description of the organ at Greenwich Hospital, the workmanship of Mr. Samuel Green, the builder of the one under our present consideration; and, although the present one is not equal to that in point of compass, yet it is by no means inferior in point of quality. This was erected in 1778, under the direction of Mr. Joah Bates,* who was appointed by his Majesty, George III., to superintend its construction. Its cost was 1,000 guineas.

It contains the undermentioned stops:—

GREAT ORGAN.

1 Stop Diapason.	
2 Open ditto.	
3 Ditto ditto.	
4 Principal.	
5 Twelfth.	
6 Fifteenth.	
7 Sexquialtra.	3 ranks.
8 Mixture.	2 ditto.
9 Trumpet.	
10 Cornet.	4 ranks.
<hr/>	
800 pipes.	

CHOIR ORGAN.

1 Stop Diapason.
2 Flute.
3 Principal.

4 Fifteenth.
5 Bassoon.

285 pipes.

SWELL.

1 Stop Diapason.	
2 Open ditto.	
3 Principal.	
4 Hautboy.	
5 Trumpet.	
6 Cornet.	3 ranks.
<hr/>	
368 pipes.	

Choir,	285 ditto.
Great organ,	800 ditto.
<hr/>	

Total number of pipes 1453

The compass of the great and choir organs is from G G to E in alt, 57 notes; that of the swell, from G (gamut) to E in alt; and the remaining eleven keys take the bass of the choir organ, so that in appearance there are three full rows of keys.

* This gentleman conducted the musical performances at Westminster Abbey, at the first Festival in commemoration of Handel, by command of George III. A.D. 1784.

This instrument was materially injured during the rebuilding of the hospital in Regent's Park, by injudicious or careless packing; but from the repair, and we may add, extensive improvement, it has lately undergone, by that skilful artist, Mr. Gray, under whose superintendence it is now placed, it may be justly considered the finest of Green's organs in the metropolis. It has also the advantage of standing in a situation very favourable to sound. The appearance of this organ, when viewed from the east end of the chapel, is very good. It has a handsome gothic mahogany case, with gilt pipes at each side, corresponding with those that stand in front.

The general character of the organs built by this artist is, that they possess more of a delicate than a ponderous tone. Green, in general, preferred quality to quantity—contrary to the feeling of many modern organ builders, who seem to prefer quantity to quality. But in the instrument under our present critique, we find both quantity and quality; and we must confess, in respect of voicing, there is more life and brilliancy in the chorus of this organ than in any other of his building in London.

LAW REPORT.

No. XXIII.—DILAPIDATIONS.

REFERRING our readers to the case of *Wise v. Metcalf*, Vol. XII. 643, and Article on Fixtures, Vol. XIV. 116, we present them with three valuable opinions on the subject by Sir W. Scott, now Lord Stowell, Mr. Serjeant Bayley, now Mr. Baron Bayley, and the late Mr Justice Dampier.

Case with the Opinion of Sir William Scott.

QUESTION.

There being a difference in opinion between the Rector of A—, in the county of York, and the executor of the late incumbent thereof respecting the true sense of the word "Dilapidations," and a very wide difference in consequence between the estimates of the workmen employed by the same parties, Sir William Scott is desired to give the legal acceptation of the word "Dilapidations;" i. e. whether it implies the same as, or more than, what is generally understood by the words "complete repairs in common

tenantry," and if more, how far he thinks it extends beyond them.

ANSWER.

I am of opinion that dilapidations go beyond what is generally understood "by complete repairs in common tenantry," at least beyond what I understand by that expression. I understand by dilapidations (and I think I am fully supported by the decisions of competent Courts in understanding so), such repairs and renewals, and if I may use the word, renovations, if necessary, of the house and its appendages, as will enable the incumbent to enter upon and inhabit them at the period the law entitles him to take possession, or as soon after as may be, allowing reasonable time for these repairs, &c. &c.

Dilapidations, therefore, will include not only all repairs merely substantial, but likewise some of a more ornamental nature. The house must be in proper condition as to white-washing and paint, because it cannot otherwise

be decently inhabited: I do not mean that it is to be new white-washed and painted, if the white-washing and painting be fit for use; but if it is not so, the executor is bound to white-wash and paint it anew. I need not add that the floors, ceilings and cornices must be all in good condition: as likewise windows, frames, doors and locks; and every part of the apparatus of a decent habitation. When I say in a good condition, I mean that each should be in a sound and proper condition, fit for its respective use; their being plain is no sufficient objection against them. It would be endless for me to particularize the articles to which dilapidations extend; nor could I do it from mere memory, without having the several articles proposed to me with an inquiry upon each. But I may lay down the general principle to be this; that dilapidations are such repairs and renovations as are proper to make the house habitable with decent convenience, respect being had to the value of the benefice to which the house belongs. I take this to be the strict principle of law applying to dilapidations. I need not add that in practice this principle ought not to be acted upon with a minute and sordid rigour, but ought to be moderated in the adjustment by a liberal disregard of things trifling in their own nature and value.

Doctors' Commons, WM. SCOTT.
June 27, 1795.

Marble hearths, chimney pieces, locks on doors, belong to the successor, and cannot be removed nor charged for. So paper on walls; ranges and stoves, if fixed, belong to the successor.

CASE.

The legal acceptance is requested of the word "Dilapidations," *i. e.* whether it implies the same as, or more than what is generally understood by the words "*complete repairs in common tenancy*;" and if more, how far it extends beyond them?

Are fixtures, as kitchen ranges, brewing vessels, coppers, to be considered as belonging to the successor; or has the predecessor or his executor a right to remove them, the prede-

cessor having paid for them when he took possession of the living?

OPINION.

I am of opinion that the word "Dilapidations" does not imply more than what is generally understood by the words "*complete repairs in common tenancies*." The precedents in actions for dilapidations treat the words *dilapidated* and *out of repair* as synonymous; and I think it impossible that premises should be considered as dilapidated if they are in tenantable repair. I can find no case which ascertains what things an incumbent or his executors are entitled to remove; but unless there is a settled usage to the contrary, I think they must be bound by the same rule as applies to tenants for life and remainder-men; and if so, I am of opinion that they have no right to remove kitchen ranges, brewing vessels or coppers, if they are really fixed to the freehold. Whatever is fixed to the freehold is, *prima facie*, to be considered as passing with it; and whoever insists upon a right to remove it, must shew that the law has established an exception in his favour. An exception is established as to articles of this description, as between landlord and tenant; but I am not aware that any is established as between tenant for life and remainder-man, or predecessor and successor. I think, however, that usage of uniform might give the right of removal in this case; and therefore, if it should turn out upon inquiry that by the established usage these things have been either paid for by the successor, or removed, I should think in this instance they might be removed; but without this usage I think they cannot. The circumstance that the predecessor paid for them in this instance when he took possession of the living, is of very little weight; for the question is not what has been done at this living, but what is the established usage as to livings in general. I would have the usage, therefore, inquired into, and the claim may either be insisted upon or given up, according to the result of that inquiry.

JOHN BAYLEY.

Temple, Jan. 7th, 1805.

Opinion of Mr. Dampier on the same Case.

As I understand the law on this subject, the successor is entitled to have the buildings belonging to the living put into complete substantial repair, respect being had to the age of the respective buildings, and the materials of which they are composed. I believe that of late a claim for painting has been allowed in the Ecclesiastical Courts, upon the principle, I presume, that it is necessary for the preservation of the wood work;

but cases of this sort come so seldom before Courts of Common law, that I am not aware that this doctrine has received the sanction of the Courts in Westminster-hall, though I incline to think that if the point came in question there, it would be decided according to the practice of the Ecclesiastical Court. I think that in the case stated, the fixtures do not belong to the successor, but to the predecessor or his executor.

H. DAMPIER.

Temple, Dec. 22d, 1804.

MONTHLY REGISTER.

CHURCH SOCIETIES.

S. P. C. K.

THE Master of the Temple lately gave notice of a motion to the effect, that the Standing Committee should hereafter consist of the Archbishops and Bishops of England, and thirty-six elected members, one-third of whom should be laymen, and that one-fourth of the elected members shall go out annually by rotation, being capable of immediate re-election; also that after the alteration, the Society should only meet quarterly. This motion was referred to the Standing Committee, and at the Monthly Meeting on Tuesday, Feb. 4th, they made their Report; which in substance stated, that the Standing Committee at present consist of the Archbishops and Bishops, and the following thirty-two members:—

Very Rev. Dean of Chichester.

The Rev. Archdeacon Pott.

_____ Cambridge.

_____ Watson.

_____ Jones.

_____ Lyall.

_____ Hamilton.

_____ Hollingsworth.

_____ Barnes.

Rev. William Agutter.

C. F. Barnwell, Esq.

Rev. Dr. Barrett.

Rev. Gilbert Beresford.

Rev. A. M. Campbell.

Richard Clarke, Esq.

Rev. Dr. Dealtry.

Rev. Dr. D'Oyley.

T. G. Estcourt, Esq., M. P.

Rev. E. W. Grinfield.

Rev. W. H. Hale.

Edward Hawkins, Esq.

Rev. John Lonsdale.

Rev. H. H. Norris.

Rev. C. A. Ogilvie.

Baden Powell, Esq.

Rev. Dr. Russell.

Rev. T. L. Strong.

Rev. Dr. Spry.

Rev. J. E. Tyler.

Rev. W. Vaux.

Rev. J. G. Ward.

Joshua Watson, Esq.

That this Committee manage the affairs of the Society, but subject to the control of the members at large; that vacancies be filled up by the Society, which has hitherto invariably adopted the recommendation of the Standing Committee; and that the Standing Committee see no reason for any change. But that as circumstances have produced vacancies in the Committee, they recommend the following twelve gentlemen to fill up the same:—

Rev. R. G. Baker.

Rev. Thomas Bowdler.

Rev. Allen Cooper.
 William Cotton, Esq.
 Rev. J. W. Cunningham.
 Joseph Delafield, Esq.
 Rev. Percival Frye.
 Rev. Richard Harvey.
 John Diston Powles, Esq.
 Rev. Hugh James Rose.
 Rev. Dr. Roy.
 James Trimmer, Esq.

It was proposed to proceed immediately to the reception of this Report, when W. W. Hull, Esq., stated that he had received a letter from the Master of the Temple, expressing an expectation that the Committee would make their report, but that the discussion of so important a question would be reserved for some future occasion. It was finally decided that this Report should be taken into consideration at the next monthly meeting.

S. P. C. K.—SPECIAL MEETING.

AT a special general meeting of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, on Monday, February 10th, 1834, his Grace the ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY in the chair, the following Resolutions were passed:—

1. That a separate Committee be appointed for the purpose of superintending the publication, and promoting the circulation of the Holy Scriptures in foreign languages, and also of Versions of the English Liturgy.

2. That a grant be made to that Committee of a sum or sums of money, to be drawn for from time to time, as the Committee may require, to an amount not exceeding in the whole 4,000*l*.

3. That donations* and annual subscriptions be received from any persons wishing to promote the objects for which the Committee is formed, provided that such Donors or Subscribers do not thereby become members of the Society, and that the amount of these donations and annual subscriptions be placed at the disposal of the Committee.

4. That the Lord Bishop of London be requested to communicate with his

Grace the President, as to the persons who shall be appointed members of the Committee.

Agreed unanimously, That the thanks of this meeting be given to his Grace the President, for his courteous and impartial conduct in the chair.

The above proceedings of the special meeting of the Christian Knowledge Society claim the serious attention of all those members who adhere to the principles which have characterised it to the present period, and who have given it their support as the best bulwark of the Church of England, and as the depository of sound religious instruction adapted to all the stages and circumstances of the christian life, to which the Clergy may resort with confidence for aid in the prosecution of their pastoral labours. The separate fund and its Committee, constituted by the vote of that meeting, are contrived for a refuge for the destitute Churchmen, for whom the Bible Society is too bad, and the Christian Knowledge Society too good an asylum. The party who have effected this, have already made the Sister Society in Ireland a mere *caput mortuum*, and they will never cease the insidious warfare they have commenced till they have reduced ours to the same state of degradation, and have taken full possession of it for themselves. To bring the subject before such of our readers as take an interest in the prosperity of the most important Church Society, we cannot do better than submit to them the Resolutions of the Bath District Committee, expressive of their unanimous sentiments upon the measure in question; and though the communication made no impression on the meeting to which it was addressed, we trust the great body of the Society dispersed throughout the kingdom will fully weigh this new feature, and will institute such proceedings of their own, in concert with the Bath Committee, as the emergency seems to require.

* A munificent donation of 250 guineas has been received, in aid of the Society's fund for printing and circulating the Bible and Prayer Book in foreign languages.

BATH DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

A SPECIAL Meeting of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge having been summoned, to take into consideration the expediency of appointing a separate Committee to superintend the publication, and promote the circulation of Versions of the Holy Scriptures, and of the Book of Common Prayer in foreign languages; and likewise of establishing a separate Fund for the extension of the Society's operations in this department of its designs:—

It was unanimously resolved by the Bath District Committee, assembled at Weymouth House, Jan. 30, 1834; the Rev. G. A. BAKER in the Chair;

On the motion of Johnson Phillett, Esq. Mayor of Bath; seconded by the Rev. C. M. Mount, that the following resolutions of this Committee be laid before the Parent Society for their consideration:—

1. That it is the opinion of this Committee, that the operations of this Society should be strictly confined to the limits of the British Empire.

2. That no part of the funds ought to be appropriated to other than the general purposes of the Society, within the limits aforesaid.

Signed, G. A. BAKER, M.A.
Chairman.

W. D. WILLIS, M. A. *Dist. Sec.*

—
To the Rev. W. Parker.

MY DEAR SIR,—Above I send you the resolutions unanimously passed at a meeting of the Bath Committee, called for the purpose of considering the propositions announced in the Advertisement, summoning a general special meeting of the Society in London. I am desirous to express the sentiments of our Committee in explanation of the above resolutions; that if it should be deemed expedient for the Society to engage in the translation, printing, and circulation of the Holy Scriptures and Liturgy in foreign languages, to a greater extent than at present, (of the expediency of which they entertain a strong doubt,)

those languages, we are persuaded, ought to be *such only* as are used within the limits of the British dominions. The Committee are clearly of opinion, that the expenses of these foreign translations, or reprintings, should be defrayed out of a fund, separate (as it is proposed) from that of the general designs of the Society, and raised specifically for the purpose. And moreover, that in the event of such fund being raised, and given in trust to the Society, that the contributors to any such separate fund, not being members subscribing to the *general designs*, should not, in consequence of contributing to such fund *alone*, be constituted *members* of the Society. We strongly deprecate any part of the present funds of the Society being appropriated to the undertaking; for, however large the income may be, it is not sufficient to carry forward our present operations on a scale to which they might be extended. It is to be remembered how few Bibles or books of any kind the Society distributes *gratuitously*; and surely, if it could be afforded, much might be done which is *not done* in this way at home.

We feel convinced that many of our subscribers, as well as those of other districts, will not choose their money to be expended in providing Bibles for the members of foreign Churches, and erecting machinery for their distribution in other lands, while the poor of England, and the still poorer in spiritual knowledge abounding in our Colonies, are left unsupplied. As members of this National Church, we conceive that this, our Church Society, has no right to interfere with the translations and spiritual business of other national churches. This may be competent, perhaps, for the Bible Society, which has no distinctive church character, but not for us. Should any *surplus* income be found over and above the current expenditure of the Society, a most ample field for its employment is spread before us. In such case,—we might almost say in *any* case, the destitution and misery impending over the affairs and the Missionaries of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in

Foreign Parts, has the *first* claim upon the bounty of the Society. For, if a wider extension of our operations be deemed expedient, can a more effectual instrument for promoting Christian Knowledge in our foreign possessions be procured, than that institution which sends forth the word of God by the *living preachers* of the gospel?

1. We trust, therefore, that if the Parent Board should deem it expedient to extend the operations of the Society, so as to embrace foreign translations of the Bible and Liturgy, such operations will be strictly confined to the limits of the British Empire.

2. And also, that no part of our present funds be expended on the undertaking, whether thus limited or not; and,

3. That, if a separate fund be raised, the subscribers to *that fund alone*, become not, in consequence, *members* of the Society; and

4. That on no account will this Society interfere with the business of Foreign Churches.

Believe me, my dear Sir, very faithfully yours,

W. D. WILLIS, *Dis. Sec.*
Depository, 10, Argyle-street, Bath,
Feb. 6, 1834.

S. P. G.—LICHFIELD.

As great exertions are now being made in various parts of the kingdom, for the benefit of the above Society, in consequence of the gradual discontinuance of the Parliamentary Grant, and in furtherance of the views of the Board in London, which has lately printed (in accordance with a suggestion of the Lichfield Diocesan Committee) "*Extracts from the Annual Report and Correspondence*," for the encouragement of *low* subscriptions, I have thought it might answer a useful purpose to make known, through the medium of your valuable miscellany, the successful results of the latter measure in this city, and its immediate vicinity, and the simple means by which the interests of the Society have here been largely promoted, with reference to

contributors among the middle classes of the community. In pursuance of their views, the resident Clergy proceeded to circulate copies of the "*Extracts*" generally among their parishioners; and after a short interval the Parochial Minister, accompanied by the Diocesan Secretary, commenced a personal canvass, of which the results far exceeded their expectations. I should observe, that in no instance was pressing solicitation used, but merely (after explaining the antiquity and excellence, the designs and objects, of the Incorporated Society, its enjoyment of the patronage of the whole Episcopal Bench, its maintenance of a well-educated and regularly ordained Clergy as Missionaries, its support of colleges and schools in North America and the East Indies, its close and exclusive connexion with the Church of England, the withdrawal of the Parliamentary Grant, &c. &c.) a willingness was expressed to receive any annual subscriptions (or donations) which might be freely tendered. In this manner, the members of our Committee were gradually increased from 80,—a very respectable number,—to 211, of whom 109 are of the class above-mentioned, contributing yearly more than 30*l.* Twenty-five annual Subscribers of one guinea and upwards, were at the same time added to the list. I shall only observe, in conclusion, that the experience of my coadjutors and myself justifies the conviction; that much more might be effected by a little exertion than is usually imagined, that a readiness to contribute to religious charities, too frequently perverted to sectarian purposes, unless properly directed, forms a prevailing spirit of the age; and that our visit was generally well received, and even acknowledged as an honour.

SPENCER MADAN,
Lichfield Dioc. Sec.

AT the eleventh annual meeting, holden in the Consistory Court of the Cathedral, on Thursday, the 26th of December, 1833, the Hon and Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of the Diocese, President, in the chair, the Secretary

announced the adoption by the Board in London; of the suggestion of this Committee to publish annually "Extracts from the Report and Correspondence," for the use and encouragement of contributors from the middle classes of the community. The list of Subscribers, of whom, in the city of Lichfield, upwards of 100 (or about half the whole number) contribute annually from two shillings and sixpence to half-a-guinea, sufficiently shews the successful results of this measure.

It appeared from the Treasurer's accounts, that a balance, amounting to 95*l.* 3*s.* 10*d.*, had been remitted to the Parent Society in the course of the year.

SPENCER MADAN, Sec.

[The Subscribers for the present year amount to 211, and their contributions to near 150*l.*]

NATIONAL SCHOOL IN PRESTBURY.

At this place, a National School, sufficiently capacious for the reception of fifty boys and fifty girls, is about to be built, and to be supported by subscription. T. Edwards, Esq. and the Rev. J. Edwards, Incumbent of Prestbury, have offered a piece of ground for the purpose; and these gentlemen, in conjunction with Major Baines, the Rev. C. Capel, Messrs. Smith, Whalley, and J. Nicholson, constitute a committee for the purpose of effecting the benevolent and desirable object.

BRITISH SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING THE RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION.

WE are happy to observe, that not only is a deeper interest expressed in the proceedings of this Society; but that the Committee are making strenuous exertions to stem the tide of Popery, and extend the saving knowledge of the gospel of our Lord.

A priestly faction rules Ireland with a rod of iron, and their Jesuitical emissaries are on the alert in England, and have even attempted the establishments of *idol-worship* in Cambridge! Surely then it is time for the Protestant priesthood to stand "up and sanctify the people." During the last quarter of 1833, meetings for this purpose were held at Southampton, Salisbury, Cambridge, and Bath. At Portsea, Inverness, and Guernsey; at Cheltenham, Ramsgate, and Hereford; in every part of the kingdom, indeed, a spirit is abroad, which, under Providence, may still defeat the machinations of the "man of sin," and his *creatures* in these realms.

At such a crisis, it cannot be matter of surprise that the neighbourhood of Epsom, which took so conspicuous a lead in opposing Popish emancipation, should be early in the field; and consequently on the 19th of February, a preliminary meeting was held at the

Spread Eagle. G. SPERLING, Esq. in the Chair.

The Chairman, in a short speech, stated the object of the Society, and expressed a fervent hope that Providence would be pleased to bless an undertaking, which had only in view the glory of God and the promulgation of the gospel of Christ.

The Rev. M. Ferrall (prayers having been said) entered at considerable length into a detail of the views of the Committee, under whom he acted. He gave all due credit to the sincerity of the Romanists, and the great talents of many of the Popish missionaries; but argued that these very circumstances called for renewed exertions on the part of the Protestants. The Rev. gentleman produced a variety of documents, shewing the progress of Popery in various parts of England, and the great increase of chapels, colleges, and schools, in those places where Popery had established her strongholds. He next adverted to the adoration of images, and the worship of the Virgin, which he shewed to be an invasion of the mediatorial kingdom of Christ; and calculated not only to rob the Son of God of his undoubted rights, but to degrade the worship of

the triune Godhead to idolatry. In conclusion, he declared that the Papists only remained in idolatry from a want of spiritual instruction, and earnestly entreated the meeting to second the objects of the Reformation Society as much as lay in their power.

H. Gosse, Esq., a county magistrate, although not exactly coinciding in all the views of the last speaker, said that the explanation now made had placed the subject in a point of view he had not hitherto contemplated it, and he should be happy to accord his support. He farther thought that a vote of thanks was due to the Reverend gentleman, for his able and explicit statements.

W. Everest, Esq. seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

The Rev. Stephen Isaacson, being especially called upon by the Chairman, said, that as a stranger, he had no intention of intruding his observations upon the meeting, but that being called upon in so pointed a manner, he felt it his duty at once to state, that he fully concurred in all the views entertained by the Society. His first labour in the ministerial field was a work against Popery, and the conviction he then felt of its errors and abominations had—

"Grown with his growth, and strengthened with his strength."

The progress of the Papal superstition was at once awful and wonderful. That men of enlightened education should relapse into the darkness of Romanism, presented to his mind a perfect anomaly: the manna of the wilderness was not so valuable to the Israelites in the desert, as the gospel to the Christian; the former nourished the mortal, the latter the immortal man; both were the gift of the same bountiful Father and God, but one was temporal, the other eternal. He should not detain the meeting by any discursive or lengthened remarks, being perfectly satisfied that all who were there assembled had but one feeling, and that feeling was that "the people might not perish for lack of knowledge."

The Rev. Mr. Darby made a few observations in support of the Society, the objects of which he declared met with his most cordial approbation.

A subscription was afterwards entered into, and a proposal made for the establishment of a permanent Committee for the formation of a Branch Association, which we sincerely hope will be carried into effect.

POLITICAL RETROSPECT.

DOMESTIC. — Parliament has at length re-assembled, and our readers will have a fair opportunity of judging what the country has to expect from a reformed House of Commons.

My Lord Grey, for every body knows, it is *his speech*, like Gratiano, "talks an infinite deal of nothing." But let that pass, and proceed we to ask, What has the Legislature done?

1. Wasted two or three nights' debate respecting an Irish papist and a briefless barrister, of whom little is known, and less cared.

2. Ministers have been *virtually* defeated on the Pension List.

3. Ditto on the Agricultural Question.

4. One night they obtained a *majority*, as *part of O'Connell's tail*, in a base attack upon Baron Smith, one of the most conscientious and upright judges that ever adorned the Irish Bench; and a few nights subsequent, they were deserted upon the same question, and left in a *minority*!!

5. The Irish Church Spoliation is progressing, and the ministers of the Established Church are to be mulcted in the amount of some 75*l.* per cent.!!

6. Mr. Stanley has eulogized all the "sayings and doings" of his worthy colleagues.

7. Lord Althorp, having pronounced the Agricultural interest to be in a most depressed condition, and the Commercial and Manufacturing to be most encouraging, (see Speech from the throne,) *candidly, logically, and with sound policy*, relieves the latter, which wanted, by his own account, no such relief, at the expense of the former, which on all hands is acknowledged to be in a most deplorable condition. Verily the men of Gotham are not the only sapient sages!

FRANCE. — We last month announced that the volcano was beginning to smoke. Since then flames have issued from the craters of *Lyons* and *Marseilles*, and the lava tide sets strong towards Paris.

SPAIN and PORTUGAL. — Petty skirmishes continue between the rebels and the troops of the two legitimate monarchs, but nothing decisive has taken place; nor is it probable that

any material change will occur, till the advance of spring enables the royal troops to take the field in force.

In other parts of the Continent things remain *in statu quo*; and the rise of the funds, both foreign and British, show that, among the moneyed interest, there is increased confidence in the permanence of the peace at present existing between the leading nations of the world.

THE COLONIES. — All at *present* remains quiet in the West Indies, but the resident planters look forward with intense anxiety to the month of August, when the new relation between the master and servant takes place.

In the East slight stroke of a political earthquake have been felt; which, amongst the reflecting portion of the community, create considerable anxiety.

CALENDARIUM ECCLESIASTICUM.

MARCH, 1834.

SAINTS' DAYS, &c.	AUTHORS to be CONSULTED.	SUBJECT OF SERMONS.
ANNUNCIATION OF THE VIRGIN MARY. (March 25.)	Dr. M. Hole. IV. 77. 85. Dr. Stanhope. IV. 186. 200. Dr. A. Littleton. I. Dr. N. Marshall. III. 101. Bp. Bull. I. 135. Abp. Wake. I. 303. Scriptural Essays. I. 1. R. Nelson. Chap. XIV.	Annunciation.
GOOD - FRIDAY, (March 28.)	Dr. R. Moss. I. 209. B. Newton. I. 49. — 71. — II. 3. Dr. R. Bundy. II. 17. — III. 1. — 201. Xn. Rememb. VII. 19. W. Jones. Post. Ser. I. 16 — 363. B. B. Stevens. 188. 204. { J. Morton. I. 269. — II. 355. J. Bean. 209. J. Rogers. I. 297.	The Sufferings of Christ. On the Fulfilment of Zech. xii. 10. On the expiatory Sacrifices under the Law; and how fulfilled in Christ. A Council of the Chief Priests and Pharisees. Origin, Design, and Efficacy of Sacrifice. The knowledge of Christ Crucified. Cross of Christ the Christian's glory. Sufferings necessary to Perfection. Passion of Christ. The Crucifixion, historically and prac- tically treated. Christ Crucified. The Death and Resurrection of Christ. The Atonement. Death and Sufferings of Christ.

UNIVERSITY, ECCLESIASTICAL, AND PAROCHIAL INTELLIGENCE.

***** TRIBUTES OF RESPECT.

THE REV. JOHN HODGSON, Vicar of Hartburn, Northumberland, has been presented with a handsome silver tea-service, by his late parishioners in Jarrow and Heworth, upon his resignation of that living, as a testimony of their esteem and respect for his long and valuable services. Mr. Hodgson has been Perpetual Curate of Jarrow and Heworth for about twenty-five years.

REV. GEORGE NORWOOD.—The inhabitants of the parish of Harrietsham, in Kent, have lately presented to the Rev. George Norwood, a handsome silver salver, in testimony of their high respect and regard for the zeal with which he laboured to promote their spiritual welfare, as Curate, and the kind and prompt assistance he at all times rendered to the poor.

REV. JOHN GARBETT.—The congregation of St. George's Church, Birmingham, have entered into a handsome subscription to present a piece of plate to their Minister, the Rev. John Garbett.

REV. JOHN BLENNERHASSET.—The Rev. John Blennerhasset, Rector of Ryme Intrinseca, Dorset, was lately presented by Lieutenant-Colonel King, on behalf of himself and the parishioners of Folke, principally of the industrious poor, with a very handsome silver cup, as a grateful testimony of their high esteem for the Rev. Gentleman in the performance of his clerical duties, and general kindness to the parishioners, during the period of a twelvemonth, in which he officiated for the late incumbent, at the church of that place. The following inscription was engraved on the cup:—"The grateful tribute of the parish of Folke to the Rev. John Blennerhasset, as a token of their high respect. 1833."

REV. ROBERT EDEN.—The Pupils of Hackney Grammar School have presented a handsome embossed silver salver to the Head Master, the Rev. Robert Eden, M.A., late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, in token of their esteem and affection.

◆

PRESENTATION OF THE ADDRESS FROM THE CLERGY TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.—Thursday morning, February 6th, having been appointed for his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury to receive the Address of the Clergy of England and Wales, at twelve o'clock, the Clergy, who had previously assembled at the house of Messrs. Rivington, in Waterloo-place, proceeded to Lambeth Palace, where they were received in the library by his Grace the Archbishop, who was attended by his Chaplains: when the Venerable James Croft, Archdeacon of Canterbury, addressed the Archbishop in the following words:—

"As Premier Archdeacon of England, I have the high honour of being deputed by my reverend brethren to approach your Grace, on the present important occasion, with the Address of the Clergy of England and Wales; nor will I, in my own person, venture to say more than that I feel entitled thus to designate an address, which, notwithstanding some few slight and immaterial variations, is, in all instances, substantially the same, and has received the signatures of 6,530 ministers of our Apostolical Church."

The Archdeacon then proceeded to read the Address:—

"We, the undersigned Clergy of England and Wales, are desirous of approaching your Grace with the expression of our veneration for the sacred office, to which, by Divine Providence, you have been called, of our respect and affection for your personal character and virtues, and of our gratitude for the firmness and discretion which you have evinced in a season of peculiar difficulty and danger.

"At a time when events are daily passing before us which mark the growth of latitudinarian sentiments, and the ignorance which prevails concerning the spiritual claims of the Church, we are especially anxious to lay before your Grace the assurance of our devoted adherence to the apostolical doctrine and polity of the Church over which you preside, and of which we are Ministers; and our deep-rooted attachment to that venerable Liturgy, in which she has embodied, in the language of ancient piety, the orthodox and primitive faith.

"And while we most earnestly deprecate that restless desire of change which would rashly innovate in spiritual matters, we are not less solicitous to declare our firm conviction, that should any thing, from the lapse of years or altered circumstances, require renewal or correction, your Grace, and our other spiritual rulers, may rely upon the cheerful co-operation and dutiful support of the Clergy, in carrying into effect any measures that may tend to revive the discipline of ancient times, to strengthen the connexion between the Bishops, Clergy, and people, and to promote the purity, the efficiency, and the unity of the Church."

To which his Grace the Archbishop returned the following answer.—

"Mr. Archdeacon, and my Venerable and Reverend Brethren,—I receive, with peculiar pleasure, this expression of your kindness towards me, and your approbation of my humble endeavours to do my duty; but I feel still greater satisfaction when I consider the object which you have principally in view, and the good effects which may be anticipated from this public declaration of your sentiments. If it has been ever surmised that the Clergy are wanting in attachment to the doctrine and polity of our United Church; that they have ceased to venerate the Liturgy, are distrustful of their spiritual governors, and desirous of change, this manifestation of your opinions and feelings will correct the mistake, and dissipate the hopes which may have been built on it. If, again, they are charged with partiality for defects and corruptions, and determined aversion to improvement, from bigotry or baser motives, such imputations are shown to be groundless by this Address.

"I regard it as a direct contradiction of misrepresentation and falsehoods of different kinds, which have been widely circulated; as an avowal of your unshaken adherence to our National Church, its faith and its formularies; and as a testimony of your veneration for the episcopal office, and of your cordial respect for your Bishops. By thus coming forward, you make known to the public the real dispositions of the Clergy; you place their love of order and of ancient principles beyond the reach of suspicion; you discourage rash innovation, without shutting the door against any improvements, which may be deemed sufficiently important to outweigh the evils incidental to change.

"To myself and the other Prelates, although we have never had reason to doubt of the affection of our brethren, this voluntary assurance of your co-operation will yield effective support, and impart additional confidence. The gratifying proofs which you on this day have afforded us of your approval in respect to the past, and of your reliance on our continued fulfilment of our sacred duties, are equally calculated to allay our anxieties, and to animate our exertions. For myself, I confess that, while I am deeply impressed with a sense of our danger, and conscious of my own infirmity, I look to the future without dismay, in the hope that, through the blessing of Almighty God, and the aid of his Holy Spirit, the Church may not only be preserved from the perils which now threaten its existence, but be securely and permanently established, with an increase of usefulness and honour."

The Archbishop then received and returned the compliments of each of the Clergy present, when they withdrew.

We understand that the addresses from some Dioceses and archdeaconries have not been yet received, but the aggregate number of signatures will probably exceed 8,000.

An Address similar to the above, unanimously signed by the Clergy of the Diocese of Gloucester, was presented to their learned Bishop, whose reply was manly, elegant, and firm, testifying his "extreme satisfaction at seeing such a complete union and coincidence of sentiment as appears to actuate the Clergy in supporting the *integrity of our scriptural Establishment*; a union which must confound the hopes of those who reckoned upon internal divisions in the Church, as a means of advancing their designs for her overthrow."

REGIUM DONUM.—This was a sum of money annually allowed by the Treasury, as a royal bounty to Dissenting teachers. It originated, we are told, in the reign of George II., in 1723, when 500*l.* was given at the suggestion of a Mr. D. Burgess, a son of the celebrated Dissenting teacher of that name, who had been some time secretary to

the Prince of Wales. Since that period, the grant has been gradually augmented to nearly 2000*l.* per annum.

On the new arrangements of the Civil List, the annual bounty ceased to be a royal gift, and was therefore denominated the Parliamentary Gift, which is now annually voted, and paid, as aforetime, to a Dissenting Minister, as the receiver named in the Treasury warrant, who, with eight others, forming three from each denomination, distribute it in small sums to their needy brethren, at their discretion.

The distributors are a self-constituted body, and are only responsible to the Treasury, where their accounts have been scarcely ever demanded. Though acting for their brethren, yet, as they exercise no authority over them, their resolutions cannot affect this grant further than as the public and the Parliament shall know, that the great majority of those ministers and other gentlemen who constitute the Board of Dissenting deputies, the United Committee, and the body of Dissenting Ministers of the three denominations, have agreed, that the practice of receiving public money is inconsistent with the generally avowed principles of Protestant Dissenters, and that they deem it highly expedient that it be discontinued. At a general meeting of the Deputies, it was so determined, and at a very numerous assembly of the three denominations, held on Thursday, the 30th of January, at Redcross-street Library, a resolution to the same effect was carried by an overwhelming majority.

Query.—Have the recipients of this bounty given their assent to the resolution of the wisecracks of Redcross-street?

WORCESTER.—Our excellent Diocesan has, with his accustomed solicitude for the welfare and good regulation of his Diocese, determined on reviving in the various Deaneries within his Lordship's jurisdiction in Worcestershire and Warwickshire, the ancient office of Rural Dean, which has been discontinued in the Diocese for nearly a century; and we are happy to find that so proper a person, in all respects, as the Right Hon. and Rev. Lord Aston has been the first of the Beneficed Clergy to accept, from the hands of the Bishop, the appointment to so honourable, useful, and important an office.—X.

BISHOP OF SALISBURY.—We feel it to be a duty to call the attention of our readers to another, among the numerous instances of liberality and beneficence, with which the name of the Bishop of Salisbury is associated. It is well known that the College for Clerical Education at Lampeter, in Cardiganshire, was founded by his Lordship when he presided over the see of St. David, and that he largely contributed by pecuniary donations to its erection. He still cherishes towards this useful institution feelings truly paternal, of which he has recently given a munificent proof, by the establishment of four scholarships of ten pounds each for the encouragement and reward of theological and literary proficiency among the students. The proceeds of 400*l.* 3 per cents. bequeathed to the College by the late Mrs. Hannah More, are, we understand, to be appropriated in a similar manner, and we are glad to learn that a subscription has commenced for a further increase of scholarships and exhibitioners. The price of tuition also, in the College, has recently been reduced. These concurring circumstances will operate most beneficially on the future prosperity of the College. We hear that the general merits of the candidates for orders, educated there, have reflected much honour on the institution.

BISHOP OF DURHAM.—Another instance of the munificence of the Venerable Bishop of Durham, in addition to the countless acts of his benevolence we have had to record, has come to our knowledge. All the leases of the property of Norton Grammar School having been suffered to expire, by the negligence of the late Master, and the school and house allowed to become a perfect ruin, part of the former having actually fallen, his Lordship has not only re-endowed the school, but contributed the greatest part of the funds requisite for restoring and ornamenting the buildings, which now form a neat and commodious residence. This is not all; for little more than a year ago, we understand, the Bishop contributed a hundred pounds towards the erection of a large and handsome "National School" in the same beautiful village. He has also, with his usual liberality, has given 50*l.* towards building a school at Cornforth.

CHELTHENHAM.—We have the greatest satisfaction in announcing to the friends of the Church of England, that the Cheltenham Clerical and Lay Declaration of attachment and fidelity to its discipline and ritual, and the Petition to the King, have received between two and three thousand signatures in this town and neighbouring parishes. We understand that the Chairman of the Committee of the Cheltenham Church of England Association, R. B. Cooper, Esq., has already forwarded the Petition to his Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester, with a request that his Royal Highness would, from his well-known attachment to the Church and to this town, lay the same at the foot of the throne.

BURIAL OF UNBAPTIZED PERSONS.—A letter from the Bishop of Exeter to one of his Clergy in Cornwall, relative to the burial of unbaptized children, has just been published. The Clergyman in question had refused to bury a child who had not been baptized, but had been named by a Baptist minister; in consequence of which refusal great excitement had prevailed in his parish, and he wrote to the Bishop of his diocese for instructions in the event of such a case recurring. The Bishop states in his letter, that it will be the Clergyman's duty to do as he has already done, as the Rubric expressly says, "The Office of the Burial of the Dead is not to be used for any that die unbaptized."—See *CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCE*, Vol. XIV.

NEW CHURCH AT EXETER.—The new church now approaches completion, and attracts the notice of the many visitors to the lovely Vale of Ide. It is a handsome structure, built by Messrs. Cornish and Julian, of that city, and in its erection reflects great credit on them, as well as the Rev. Mr. Erle, through whose great exertion the sacred edifice has been constructed.

NEW CHURCH IN STRATFORD-LE-BOW.—This church was lately consecrated by the Lord Bishop of London, assisted by his Registrar and other officers, and many of the Clergy of the diocese. The morning service was read by the Rev. Archdeacon Jones, Rector of the parish; and, after the usual ceremony had been gone through, the Rev. Prelate delivered a most excellent and impressive sermon to a very crowded congregation, composed of members of most of the respectable families in that extensive parish. A collection was subsequently made, and nearly 90*l*. were subscribed towards a fund for erecting a charity school for the education of the poor of the parish.

NEW CHURCHES IN AMERICA.—Our readers will be delighted to learn, that the prospects of the Episcopal Church in America were never more flourishing than at the present period. In New York new churches are springing up in almost every direction. The truly excellent Bishop, some months back, completed his annual visitation of one section of the diocese, having travelled more than eleven hundred miles. He was then about to commence another laborious tour, when he expected to consecrate seventeen new churches. Among them is a beautiful stone edifice, built at Auburn, on the site of the one destroyed by fire last year. Dr. Rudd, the former laborious and distinguished Rector of this parish, has been obliged to relinquish his charge owing to ill-health and loss of voice.

HARPUR CHARITY, BEDFORD.—By the recently published accounts of the revenue and expenditure of the Harpur Charity, it appears, that the net income last year was 13,538*l*. 10*s*. 8*d*., and the expenditure 12,475*l*. 9*s*. 5*d*., including the following items:—Schools, 2,184*l*. 19*s*. 8*d*.; exhibitions, 640*l*.; marriage-portions, 520*l*.; hospital for children, 675*l*. 8*s*. 1*d*.; apprentice-premiums, 979*l*.; donations on going out to service, 67*l*.; benefactions to apprentices after service, 350*l*.; alms-houses, 1,997*l*. 0*s*. 1*d*.; distributed to the poor, 500*l*.; schools and other buildings, 1,200*l*. in addition to 6,000*l*. previously paid on that account.

DURHAM UNIVERSITY.—The Dean and Chapter have received the following books for the University Library:—from J. Ward, Esq., of this city, Carr's *Historia Literaria*, 2 vols. folio; Wood's *Hist. Oxon.*; Pignorius de *Mensa Isaica*, 4to.; Ross's *Antiquitates Atticæ*, and two other rare Tracts. From the Rev. Ralph

Tatham, Fellow of St. John's, Cambridge, and Public Orator : Fabri Thesaurus, and Petavius de Doctrina Temporum. From the Rev. T. Gisborne : the Works of Mrs. Hannah More, and his own Works. From Charles Whitley, Esq. : the Foreign Quarterly, 11 vols.

SHEERNESS.—The question of building a new church or chapel of ease for Sheerness has been recently revived, and a certain portion of the inhabitants are extremely anxious to have it carried into effect. Dr. Poore, as Rural Dean, has paid a visit to Sheerness on the subject, and the Commissioners for Building New Churches have engaged to pay half the expense : the Archbishop of Canterbury has promised two hundred guineas ; Sir Edward Banks, and two other gentlemen, it is said, two hundred or three hundred more ; and the Board of Ordnance offered a site for the building.

GRAVESEND.—A handsome Proprietary Chapel is now building at Gravesend, calculated to hold 1500 persons.

HUDDERSFIELD PARISH CHURCH.—The subscriptions for the repair of this edifice now amount to nearly 1,600*l*. Sir John Ramsden, Bart. has given 400*l*. ; Stansfield Rawson, John Starkey, Thomas Starkey, Joseph Starkey, and J. Brook, Esqrs., 100*l*. each. Joseph Armitage, and J. C. Laycock, Esqrs., and Dr. Walker, 50*l*. each. The subscribers have resolved to relinquish the sum voted by the parish, and to defray the whole expense by subscription.

POPERY !!!—"The number of Roman Catholics in England is daily augmenting. At Bristol, Dr. Baines, V. A., lately administered the rite of confirmation to 300 persons, of whom 86 are recent converts to the Roman Catholic religion." !! Who believes all this ?

The Roman Catholics of Birmingham met last week to consider the practicability of erecting a *Cathedral* in that town. Among those who took part in the proceedings was Mr. Hansom, the architect, who said he was sure they might set up a building which would outvie any place of worship in the town. Dr. Walsh, Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District, presided on the occasion, and expressed his intention of giving 200*l*. to the fund, and a monthly contribution of 1*l*. towards payment of the interest of money to be borrowed.

ENGLISH ESTABLISHED CHURCH AT HAMBURGH.—The following official notification has been made by the authorities of this city :—"The privileges of our established congregation having now been constitutionally conferred on the professors of the Anglo-Episcopal Church, it has also been deemed expedient to remove any doubt on the subject of the official acts hitherto performed in this city by the Clergyman of that Church ; it has, therefore, been constitutionally resolved : That all the official acts hitherto performed here since the abolition of the Court, by the Clergyman of the Anglo-Episcopal Church, who has been tolerated in his functions, shall be considered as if he had been formally confirmed by the State, and shall have the same force, which is hereby made known to, and recommended to the attention of all.—Given at our Assembly of the Senate, at Hamburgh, the 20th of January, 1834."

DOWAGER LADY LYTTLETON.—The Dowager Lady Lytton, of Peachfield Lodge, near Malvern, has transmitted, through the hands of the Bishop of Worcester, the very handsome donation of 20*l*. to the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts ; and her Ladyship has also become an annual subscriber of two guineas.

EARL OF COVENTRY.—The Earl of Coventry has subscribed one hundred guineas towards the erection of a church in the Blockhouse.

IRISH REPRESENTATIVE BISHOPS.—The Archbishop of Cashel, the Bishops of Kildare, Derry, and Meath, sit as Irish Representative Peers during the ensuing session of Parliament.

BRIDGEWATER.—The sums subscribed for the erection of a new church in Bridgewater have increased within these few days; they now amount to 1,511*l.* 16*s.*

LIVERPOOL.—A numerous and respectable meeting of the lay-members of the Church of England, residing in Liverpool and its neighbourhood, comprising many of the most wealthy and influential inhabitants, was lately held in that town, John Wright, Esq., Mayor, in the Chair, when the following Resolution was unanimously agreed to:—"That, at the present eventful crisis, it is highly desirable that the friends of the Church of England, resident in the town and neighbourhood of Liverpool, should make a public and solemn declaration of their undeviating attachment to the doctrine and discipline of the Episcopal Establishment, which, by the blessing of God, has been the means of conveying inestimable advantages, religious and moral, to all classes of the community." A Committee was afterwards formed, the declaration issued by the Central Committee in London adopted, and the necessary arrangements made to obtain the signatures of those of the inhabitants who approved it.

The same has been done in numberless other parishes, and with such success that Infidels and Dissenters are somewhat dismayed.

ORDINATIONS.—1834.

Rochester . . . Feb. 16. | Worcester . . . Jan. 25.

DEACONS.

Name.	Degree.	College.	University.	By Bishop of
Begbie, Francis Richard (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	Pembroke	Camb.	Rochester
Clarke, Christopher (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	M.A.	St. John's	Camb.	Rochester
Gaskin, Thomas (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	Jesus	Camb.	Rochester
Nott, William George (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	St. John's	Camb.	Rochester
Rowlands, John (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	Queen's	Camb.	Rochester
Sergeant, Robert . . .	B.A.	Magdalen	Oxf.	Worcester
Smith, Thomas Tunstall (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	St. Peter's	Camb.	Rochester
Tucker, Comyns (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	M.A.	St. Peter's	Camb.	Rochester
Tucker, William Edwardes (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	M.A.	Trinity	Oxf.	Rochester
Weston, W. H. . . .	B.A.	All Souls	Oxf.	Worcester
Williams, John (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	Trinity	Dublin	Rochester
Yate, Charles (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	M.A.	St. John's	Camb.	Rochester

PRIESTS.

Allen, J. H. T. . . .	B.A.	Brasenose	Oxf.	Worcester
Bull, John (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	St. John's	Camb.	Rochester
Davis, B. . . .	B.A.	Queen's	Oxf.	Worcester
Evans, John Harrison (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	St. John's	Camb.	Rochester
Fell, Thomas (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	St. Peter's	Camb.	Rochester
French, T. . . .	B.A.	Jesus	Oxf.	Worcester
Foley, E. Walwyn . . .	B.A.	Wadham	Oxf.	Worcester
Gurney, Thomas (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	St. John's	Camb.	Rochester
Heaviside, James Wm. L. (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	M.A.	Sidney Sussex	Camb.	Rochester
Hurst, Samuel Sheppard (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	Trinity	Camb.	Rochester
Izon, W. K. . . .	B.A.	Pembroke	Camb.	Worcester
Langley, Thomas (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	St. John's	Camb.	Rochester
Liddell, Robert (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	All Souls'	Oxf.	Rochester
Lloyd, M. (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	St. John's	Camb.	Worcester
Peill, John Newton (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	Queen	Camb.	Rochester
Pritchard, R. . . .	B.A.			Worcester
Purdon, William (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	St. John's	Camb.	Rochester
Roe, C. . . .	B.A.	Trinity	Oxf.	Worcester
Stainforth, Francis John (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	M.A.	St. John's	Camb.	Rochester
Taylor, John (<i>let. dim.</i>) . . .	B.A.	Caius	Camb.	Rochester
Thackwell, Stephen . . .	B.A.	Pembroke	Oxf.	Worcester
Turbitt, William . . .	M.A.	Pembroke	Oxf.	Worcester
Vaughan, T. C. . . .	B.A.	Magdalen Hall	Oxf.	Worcester

Deacons, 12.—Priests, 23.—Total, 35.

CLERICAL APPOINTMENTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Appointment.</i>
Barlow, Thomas William .	Chapl. to the Northampton Infirmary.
Bissett, T.	Chapl. to the Earl of Aberdeen.
Daniel, Edwin	Chapl. to Lord Godolphin.
Foster, R.	Head Mast. of the Grammar School, Aldenham, Herts.
Gray, Stuart	Chapl. to Lord Gray, of Gray.
Greville, E.	Lect. of St. Peter's, Port of Guernsey.
Newbolt, R. W.	Surrogate for Bath and Wells.
Prendergast, Joseph . . .	Head Mast. of the Grammar School at Lewisham.
Sheepshanks, Thomas . .	Head Mast. of the Free Grammar School, Coventry.
Strange, W. A.	Second Mast. of the Royal Liverpool Institution.
Wynward, John Montague	Chapl. in Ordinary to his Majesty.

PREFERMENTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Preferment.</i>	<i>County.</i>	<i>Diocese.</i>	<i>Patron.</i>
Alderson, Samuel H.	Lowdham, V.	Suffolk	Norwich	The King
Allington, J.	Candlesby, R.	Lincoln	Lincoln	Magdalen Coll. Oxf.
Apthorpe, W. H.	{ Bierton, V. with Buckland, C.	{ Bucks	{ P. D. & C. of Linc.	{ D. & C. of Lincoln
Argles, John A.	{ Goldhanger, R. with Little Totham, C.	{ Essex	London	Rev. T. Leigh
Birkett, J.	Ovingham, C.	Northam.	Durham	T. C. Bigge, Esq.
Bobart, H. H.	Benson, P. C.	Oxford	Oxford	D. & C. of Ch. Ch.
Branson, J. H.	Armthorpe	York	York	Lord Chancellor
Browne, A.	{ Flitton, V. cum Silsoe, C.	{ Bedford	Lincoln	D. & C. of Christ Ch.
Burley, W.	Enderby-Navis, R.	Lincoln	Lincoln	Rev. C. Semple
Cave, W. C. Brown . . .	Altrincham, P. C.	Cheshire	Chester	Vic. of Banden
Clarke, Ven. Archd.	{ Treasurership of Salisbury Cath. with Preb. of Calne in the same annexed			{ Bp. of Salisbury
Dawson, F.	Allhallows, Lombard-st. R.	P. Cant.		D. & C. of Canterb.
Dowling, J. G.	St. Mary-de-Crypt, Glost. R.	Gloster	Gloster	Lord Chancellor
Gauntlett, F.	Fladbury, R.	Worcest.	Wore.	{ Option of Abp. of Canterbury
Gordon, J.	Preb. of Cudworth and Knowle	Wells		Bp. of Bath & Wells
Green, G. R.	Modbury, V.	Devon	Exeter	Eton College
Hathaway, —	Oldbury	Salop	Worcest.	V. of Halesowen
Hebert, Charles	Grendon, V.	Northam.	Peterboro'	Trin. Coll. Camb.
Hodgson, W.	Bampton, V.	Westm.	Carlisle	Lord Chancellor
Howard, Hon. H. E. J.	Donnington, R.	Salop	Lichfield	D. of Sutherland
Lawrence, Thomas F.	St. Laurence, Reading, V.	Berks		St John's Coll. Oxf.
Lear, Francis	Preb. in Cath. Church of Salisbury			Ep of Salisbury
Lubbock, J.	{ Belaugh, R. cum Scottow, V.	{ Norfolk	Norwich	Bp. of Norwich
Meek, Robert	Brixton Deverell, R.	Wilts	Salisbury	Bp. of Salisbury
Meyler, T.	Haydon, P. C.	Wilts	Salisbury	Rev. A. Meyrick
Miller, F. R.	Kingston, R.	Warwick	Worc.	{ Lord Willoughby de Broke
Molyneux, Capel . . .	Trinity Chap. Woolwich	Kent		Rochester Trustees
Moore, C. F.	{ Belleau, R. with Aby, V.	{ Lincoln	Linc.	{ Lord Willoughby D'Eresby
Oliver, W.	Barlaston, P. C.	Stafford	Lichfield	D. of Sutherland
Seaman, Mechach . . .	Charles Chap. Plymouth	Devon	Exeter	Trustees
Short, W.	Preb. in Cath. Ch. of Salisb.			Bp. of Salisb.
Short, T. V.	St. George's, Bloomsbury, R.	Middl.	London	Lord Chancellor
St. John, St. And. H.	Addingham, V.	Cumb.	Carlisle	D. & C. of Carlisle
Sweet, C. Bonter . . .	Kentisbury, R.	Devon	Exeter	Rev. C. B. Sweet
Thackray, W. P. . . .	Skillington, V.	Lincoln	Lincoln	D. & C. of Lincoln

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Preferment.</i>	<i>County.</i>	<i>Diocese.</i>	<i>Patron.</i>
Verdon, E. . . .	St. Ann's, Torrington	Lancast.	Chester	Vic. of Bury
Walker, J. . . .	Kirkwelpington, V.	Northum.	Durham	Bp. of Durham
Woodcock, C. . .	Chardstock, V.	Dorset	{ P. D. of } Salisb. }	Preb. of Chardstock in Salisb. Cath.

CLERGYMEN DECEASED.

Died, on Monday, January 6, deeply lamented, the Rev. Thomas Henry Hume, M. A., Canon Residentiary of Salisbury Cathedral, in the sixty-seventh year of his age. He was the son of Dr. John Hume, who preceded Dr. Barrington as Bishop of the Diocese of Salisbury, and of Lady Mary, daughter of Earl Kinnoul. For some time past, the health of the Rev. Gentleman had been in a very declining state, and he had removed to Lyme, in Dorsetshire, to try the effects of a change of air; and there he closed his earthly career. He was a Clergyman of most exemplary piety: the very severe afflictions under which he laboured during his last years he bore with the most marked patience and resignation; and in the various relations of life, he displayed an example well worthy of general imitation. The poor of Salisbury will lose in him a most kind friend and benefactor.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Preferment.</i>	<i>County.</i>	<i>Diocese.</i>	<i>Patron.</i>
Adams, B. . . .	Barlaston, P. C.	Stafford	Lichfield	D. of Sutherland
Baty, W. . . .	Whitfield, R.	Northam.	Peterboro'	Worcester Coll. Oxf.
Coseus, Reynr . .	Mere, V.	Wilts	Salisb.	D. of Salisb.
Cripps, T. . . .	{ Cogges, C. Asthall, V.	{ Oxford	Oxford	Eton Coll.
Freeman, T. . . .	Bruntingthorpe, R.	Leicester	Lincoln	G. Bridges, Esq.
Haggitt, W. . . .	{ Byfleet, R. Sen. Chap. of Chelsea H.	{ Surrey	Winch.	Lord Chancellor
Jefferson, R. . .	South Kilvington, R.	York	York	Sidney Coll. Camb.
Jennings, Wm. . .	Baydon Chap. P. C.	Wilts	Salisbury	Rev. A. Meyrick
Landon, C. R. . .	Vange, R.	Essex	London	C. Smith, Esq.
Moore, P. W. . . .	Thakeham, R.	Sussex	Chichester	D. of Norfolk
Mosley, J. Peploe .	Rolleston, R.	Stafford	Lichfield	Sir O. Mosely, Bart.
Richardson, J. . .	Norton, P. C.	York	York	T. Ewbank, Esq.
Roles, William . .	{ Upton Lovell, Sharncott, and Rounds	{ Wilts	Salisb.	{ Lord Chancellor
Wade, T. . . .	{ Incumbent of St. Ann's, Tottington	{ Northam.	Peterb.	{
Whitfield, T. . . .	Winterbourne, R.	Lancast.	Chester	Vic. of Bury
Wood, J. . . .	{ Milborne, St. Andrew, V. Dewlish, C.	{ Glosster	Bristol	St. John's, Oxford
Wyld, J. . . .	Blunsdon, St. Andrew, R.	Dorset	Bristol	T. Gundry, Esq.
		Wilts	Salisb.	Mrs. Barker

OXFORD.

INSTALLATION OF THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.

Many erroneous accounts of the recent ceremony at Apsley House having found their way into the public papers, we think the following authentic detail may not be unacceptable to our readers:—

On Friday the 7th February, the installation or admission of his Grace the Duke of Wellington to the office of Chancellor of this University, took place at Apsley House in London.

The Vice Chancellor and Proctors, together with the several officers of the University and Members of Convocation, who had been nominated as delegates on

the occasion, assembled at Batt's hotel in Dover-street, where they were joined by Mr. Estcourt and Sir Robert H. Inglis, the representatives of the University in Parliament, and proceeded in carriages to the Duke of Wellington's mansion in Piccadilly, about six o'clock, P.M. in the following order:—

The Esquire Bedel in Theology.
The Yeoman Bedel in Arts and Medicine.
The Rev. Dr. Rowley, Master of University Coll. Vice-Chancellor of the University.
The Rev. Dr. Jenkyns, Master of Balliol, Pro-Vice-Chancellor.
The Rev. Dr. Jones, Rector of Exeter, Pro-Vice-Chancellor.

The Rev. Dr. Gilbert, Principal of Brasenose, Pro-Vice-Chancellor.
 The Rev. Dr. Wynter, President of St. John's.
 The Rev. Dr. Cramer, Principle of New Inn Hall, Public Orator.
 The Rev. Dr. Kidd, Regius Professor of Medicine, Christ Church.
 The Rev. Dr. Ashhurst, Fell. of All Souls'.
 The Rev. Dr. Bliss, Registrar of the University.
 The Rev. Mr. Bellas, Fellow of Queen's, Proctor of the University.
 The Rev. Mr. Lightfoot, Fellow of Exeter, Proctor of the University.
 The Rev. Mr. Wintle, Fellow of St. John's.
 The Rev. Mr. Rigaud, Savilian Professor of Astronomy.
 The Rev. Mr. Maude, Fellow of Queen's.
 The Rev. Mr. Plumtre, Fell. of University.
 The Rev. Mr. Ogilvie, Fellow of Balliol.
 The Rev. Mr. Wilson, Fellow of Queen's.
 The Rev. Mr. Glanville, Fellow of Exeter.
 The Members for the University.

The Delegacy, having alighted, passed through the several apartments, which were brilliantly lighted for the occasion, to the Waterloo Gallery, where the Vice-Chancellor (taking his seat at the upper end, the Registrar on his left, and a vacant chair being placed on his right hand for the Chancellor, the Proctors seated a little lower on either side, the other members of the Delegacy occupying their respective stations according to their rank, down the centre of the room,) opened the Convocation by announcing that the cause of their assembling was the admission of his Grace the Duke of Wellington to the office of Chancellor of the University, vacant by the death of Lord Grenville, to which office he had recently been elected by the unanimous voice of the Doctors and Masters of the University in Convocation assembled.

The Bedels (Mr. Forster and Mr. Brown) then left the room, and immediately returned, followed by the Chancellor elect, who appeared in his full robes of office, and took his seat, uncovered, on the right of the Vice Chancellor, the whole assembly rising at his Grace's entrance, and continuing to stand till he had taken his seat.

His Grace was accompanied by the following royal and illustrious friends, who were present during the whole ceremony :

His Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland, Chancellor of the University of Dublin.
 His Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester, Chancellor of the University of Cambridge.
 The Archbishop of Canterbury.
 The Duke of Beaufort.

The Earl of Eldon.
 Lord Talbot.
 Lord Sidmouth.
 The Bishop of Exeter.
 Sir Henry Halford.
 Sir Charles Wetherell.

As soon as the Convocation was re-seated, the Bedels deposited their staves of office upon the table, and the Vice-Chancellor handed the instrument of Election to the Registrar, who having read it aloud, returned it by the hands of the Bedel to be deposited on the table. The oaths of allegiance and supremacy were then taken by the Chancellor elect, before the senior Proctor, and immediately after the oath of office was administered to his Grace, by the Vice-Chancellor, the Duke reading the former, and responding to the latter in an audible voice and most impressive manner.

The oaths having been taken, the Vice-Chancellor then delivered into the hands of the Chancellor the instrument of Election, the Statute-book, and the Keys and Seals of Office, at the same time addressing his Grace in a speech which, although concise, was admirably adapted to the occasion, and delivered with great feeling and emphasis. The Vice-Chancellor then solemnly admitted the Chancellor to his high office, and placing his Grace in the Chair he had himself previously occupied, took his seat on the right hand and remained uncovered during the continuance of the ceremony, the Chancellor putting on his cap upon assuming his official seat.

The Public Orator (Dr. Cramer,) then advanced, and addressed the new Chancellor in a speech of congratulation, in which, after alluding to the degree of Doctor in Civil Law formerly conferred upon his Grace by Diploma, at the time of the visit of the allied Sovereigns to Oxford, which had already enrolled the Duke among the number of her most distinguished members, he took occasion to revert to his Grace's victorious achievements over the enemies of his country, nothing doubting but that his efforts in the defence of literature and religion would be attended with equal success; and congratulating the University on the election of a nobleman whose high principles, moral courage, and splendid talents were the best security for her happiness and renown.

To this address, the Chancellor replied in a speech which excited the warmest admiration in all present, as well for its pure Latinity, as his Grace's correct and emphatic delivery; and above all, for the high and honourable conservative senti-

ments that were expressed throughout the whole. His Grace modestly referring to the course of his early education and his career in after life, as rendering him unfit to preside over an eminent literary body, but confessing that the same political principles in regard to Church and State, the same respect for the royal authority, the same love for the Establishment, the same veneration for the laws and institutions of the country, expressed and inculcated by the University over which he had been called on to preside, rendered the office he had that day been invested with, as peculiarly grateful to him, and engaging to use his best and most strenuous endeavours to preserve the reputation and the rights of the University unsullied and unimpaired.

At the command of the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor then directed the Bedels to resume their staves of office, and dissolved the Convocation; the members of the Delegacy retiring in the same order they had before observed to the principal drawing-room, where they had the honour of being severally introduced to their new Chancellor.

In the evening the delegates partook of a sumptuous entertainment in the great dining-room, and had the honour of meeting the royal and illustrious persons who had been present during the installation.

COMPARATIVE STATE OF THIS UNIVERSITY, 1833—1834.

	Members of Convoc.		On the Books.	
	1832.	1834.	1833.	1834.
University	106	108	219	220
Balliol	105	105	269	275
Merton	65	62	128	130
Exeter	121	123	288	302
Oriel	142	153	300	300
Queen's	176	175	362	353
New	71	69	160	163
Lincoln	72	74	129	133
All Souls'	69	67	101	99
Magdalen	121	115	163	159
Brasenose	233	234	423	412
Corpus	81	82	127	127
Christ Church	466	475	961	974
Trinity	105	107	249	256
St. John's	117	118	221	218
Jesus	56	57	163	157
Wadham	80	78	222	235
Pembroke	92	97	189	189
Worcester	88	92	225	218
St. Mary Hall	43	20	77	41
Magdalen Hall	50	53	176	173
New Inn Hall	1	1	21	28
Alban Hall	9	9	39	38
Edmund Hall	46	45	91	92

DEGREES CONFERRED.

BACHELOR IN DIVINITY.

The Honourable and Very Reverend Henry Edward John Howard, Christ Church, Dean of Lichfield, Grand Compounder.

DOCTOR IN CIVIL LAW.

Arthur Jackson Drury, Trinity Coll.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Rev. Thomas Archer Houlton, Oriel Coll. Grand Compounder.

Rev. Walter Apsley Bathurst, Wadham Coll.

Wm. Sharington Davenport, Pembroke Coll.

Thomas William Creaser, Pembroke Coll.

Rev. Philip Kitchingman, Pembroke Coll.

Rev. Edward Thrupp, Wadham Coll.

Rev. Thomas A. Medwin, Worcester Coll.

Rev. John Wood Warter, Christ Church.

Rev. Joseph Hill Grice, Christ Church.

Rev. C. Fred. Bryan Wood, Pembroke Coll.

Rev. Geo. Ashe Goddard, Brasenose Coll.

George Caldwell, Merton Coll.

John Southwell Ifill, Magdalen Hall.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

James Boucher, Worcester Coll.

Alexander Black, Christ Church.

Erasmus Saunders, Balliol Coll.

William Edward Tucker, Trinity Coll.

William Mellish Chambers, Christ Church.

Hon. Hervey Charles Bagot, Christ Church.

Philip Tillard, Brasenose Coll.

Edward Price, Magdalen Hall.

Charles Lucas Reay, Queen's Coll.

John Finney Belfield, Oriel Coll.

H. P. Haughton, Schol. of Brasenose Coll.

George William Sandys, Pembroke Coll.

James Hicks, Oriel Coll.

In a Convocation, it was agreed to place at the disposal of the Vice-Chancellor, the sum of 200*l.* from the University chest, towards defraying the expenses of the ensuing *Encenia*.

In a Convocation, the consent of the House was given to Arthur Jackson Drury, of Trinity College, to commute the Degree of Master of Arts for that of Bachelor in Civil Law.

The Board of Heads of Houses and Proctors have fixed Tuesday the 10th of June for the day of Commemoration of Founders and Benefactors of the University.

ELECTIONS.

Mr. Thomas Briscoe, B.A. of Jesus College, has been elected a Fellow of that Society.

Mr. N. Pocock has been elected a Scholar, on the Michel Foundation, at Queen's College.

Henry William Cripps has been elected a Scholar of New College.

Mr. Wardall has been elected a Scholar of Corpus Christi College, for the county of Bedford, and Mr. Harrison, for the county of Lincoln.

The Rev. John Williams, M.A. Scholar of Jesus College, has been elected a Fellow of that Society.

Ashmolean Society, Feb. 7.—The following gentlemen were elected Members:—Rev. John Calcott, B.D. Lincoln; Rev. J. Ley, M.A. Christ Church; E. W. Jelf, B.A. Christ Church; H. M. Villiers, B.A. Christ Church; R. Lowe, B.A. University; W. Boyd, M.A. University; Mr. P. H. Nicklin, of Philadelphia.—A Member proposed the following query: What is the most probable supposition as to the existence of the Unicorn?—A paper was read by Professor Powell, on the nature of the evidence adduced in support of the laws of motion; more particularly of the second law.

The late Dr. Williams has bequeathed 500*l.* to the Physic Garden at Oxford, of which he had been the keeper for nearly forty years. Dr. Daubeny, the Professor of Chemistry, and author of a scientific work on Volcanos, succeeds him as Professor of Botany.

DIED

Universally regretted, in his 23d year, William Christopher Guise, Esq. Commoner of Christ Church, eldest son of the Rev. Powell C. Guise, Rector of Craike, Durham, and nephew of Sir William Guise, Bart. M.P. for the county of Gloucester, after a short but severe illness. Seldom, indeed, has a young man evinced higher promise of future excellence, not only from his talents and intellectual endowments, which had already obtained for him distinguished academical honours at Christ Church, but also from his exemplary conduct, and the amiability of his character; which, whilst it secured him the love and attachment of his dependents, had also most completely endeared him to every person who had the happiness of his acquaintance.

CAMBRIDGE.

DEGREES CONFERRED.

BACHELOR IN DIVINITY.

Rev. Jacob Robson.

HONORARY MASTERS OF ARTS.

Hon. William Towry Law, St. Peter's Coll.
Hon. Wm. Chafy Henniker, St. John's Coll.
William Wardlaw Ramsay, Trinity Coll.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Rev. H. Bowman Bacon, Trinity Coll. Comp.
Rev. Thomas Furlong, Queen's Coll.
Rev. Francis Duncan, Trinity Coll.
Rev. John Phillips Gurney, Queen's Coll.

BACHELORS IN CIVIL LAW.

Rev. Charles Woodward, Queen's Coll.
Rev. G. G. Graham Foster Pigott, St. Peter's Coll.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

William Charlton Frampton, Trinity Coll.
Henry Lushington, Trinity Coll.
Alexander Duncan, Trinity Coll.
William Handley, St. John's Coll.
Edward Rendell, St. John's Coll.
Charles Thomas Scott, St. John's Coll.
John Burleigh James, St. John's Coll.
W. Rowlands Evans, Corpus Christi Coll.

Henry Paul Lazonby, Jesus Coll.
John George Joakim Heysett, Trinity Coll.
George John Kennedy, St. John's Coll.
James Wharton, St. John's Coll.

The Rev. Edward Wix, M.A. of Trinity College, Oxford, Archdeacon of Newfoundland, has been admitted *ad eundem* of this University.

The Hon. George Savile, brother of Lord Pollington, has been admitted of Queen's College.

GRACES.

The following Graces have passed the Senate:—

To appoint the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Chafy, Dr. Webb, Dr. French, Mr. Tatham, Professor Musgrave, Mr. Archdale, of Emmanuel College, and Mr. Hodgson, of St. Peter's College, a syndicate respecting the old printing-house, and the adjoining premises, belonging to the University, and to report thereon to the Senate before the end of the present Term.

To appoint the Vice-Chancellor, Mr. Hodgson, of St. Peter's College, Mr. Martin, of Trinity College, Mr. Calthrop, of Corpus Christi College, and Mr. Snowball, of St. John's, a syndicate to inquire into the expense incurred on the schools in the Botanic Garden, and to report thereon to the Senate before the end of the present Term.

To allow the Vice-Chancellor to insure the schools in the Botanic Garden, and the contents thereof, for a sum not exceeding 3,000*l*.

To appoint Mr. Heath, of Trinity College, one of the Examiners of the previous Examination, in the room of Mr. Steel.

To grant Lord Melgund two days and part of a third, to complete the last Michaelmas Term, he having been detained at sea by contrary winds, and not having reached England till after the Division of the said Term.

To grant Mr. Crool 30*l*. out of the University chest in addition to his annual stipend.

CLASSICAL TRIPOS.

February 20, 1834.

EXAMINERS.

Connop Thirlwall, M.A. Trinity Coll.
Thomas Henry Steel, M.A. Trinity Coll.
Christopher Wordsworth, M.A. Trinity Coll.
John Frederick Isaacson, M.A. St. John's Coll

FIRST CLASS.

1 Kennedy, Joh.	7 Vaughan, Chr.
2 Donaldson, Trin.	8 Huxtable, Joh.
3 Forsyth, Trin.	9 Phillips, G. Trin.
4 Warter, Magd.	10 Evans, Pet.
5 Weldon, Joh.	11 Marsh, Trin.
6 Lushington, Trin.	12 Coates, Joh.

SECOND CLASS.

1 Webster, Qu.	7 Johnstone, Trin.
2 Wilkinson, Qu.	8 Morrison, Trin.
3 Stevenson, Trin.	9 Gray, Trin.
4 Barrow, Caius	10 Bailey, Trin.
5 Foster, Magd.	11 Sandford, Joh.
6 Williams, Trin.	

THIRD CLASS.

1 Bromehead, Caius	10 Fearon, Joh.
2 Hey, Joh.	11 Trentham, Joh.
3 Cotterell, Joh.	12 Gleadowe, Caius
4 Leathley, Trin.	13 Walker, Chr.
5 Palmer, Trin.	14 Downes, Trin.
6 Bryer, Joh.	15 Cumming, Em.
7 Fletcher, Pemb.	16 Braithwaite, Clare
8 Holmes, Trin.	17 Gooch, Trin.
9 Morton, Trin.	18 May, Jesus

PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

A meeting was held in February, Dr. Clarke, V.P. being in the Chair. Among the presents was a *Proteus Anguinus* offered by Mr. Lunn, with some observations on the history of our knowledge of the animal. Professor Miller communicated a notice of some optical experiments, by which it appeared that the lines seen in the vapour of Bromine and Iodine are identical in position; and that the vapour of Perchloride of Chrome exhibits lines apparently equidistant, much closer and fainter than the Bromine lines, but occupying the same part of the spectrum. Mr. Whewell read a memoir "*On the Nature of the Truth of the Laws of Motion*;" tending to shew that these laws may be demonstrated independently of experiment so far as their terms go; but that the meaning of the terms must be assigned by a reference to experiment.

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The quotations from the "Twelve Lectures," would not, we fear, in our Magazine, meet the eye for which it is intended.

Many thanks for the Fragments from Salisbury.

We should have been happy to have complied with the wishes of our correspondent "W.," but we are unable to decipher either his appointment or his christian name. We, however, are obliged by his warm expressions of approbation.

We have pleasure in announcing that the "Rev. E. Stanley, Rector of Alderby, &c. &c." who has frequently been reported as dead, is still living, and that he is in possession of one benefice only, and not three, as has been stated.

Our authority for the Conversion of the Prince of Lucca is the *Archives du Christianisme*, 14 Septembre, 1833 (p. 143, col. 1); but a Reverend Correspondent denies the fact of the Conversion.

We shall give in our next Number, a Sermon applicable to the King's Letter "on the Building and Repairing of Churches."